Gc
974.701
W52d
1757849

REYNOLDS HISTORICAL
GENEALOGY COLLECTION

ALLEN COUNTY PUBLIC LIBRARY
3 1833 01145 0746

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2015

https://archive.org/details/westchestercount00daws_0

WESTCHESTER-COUNTY, NEW YORK,

DURING

THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION.

BY

HENRY B. DAWSON,

CORRESPONDING MEMBER OF THE MASSACHUSETTS HISTORICAL SOCIETY, ETC.

NY 973.3 D

MORRISANIA, NEW YORK CITY:

1886.

177313

Henry B. Dawson

MAR 23 '73

F
85194
.305

DAWSON, HENRY BARTON, 1821-1889.
Westchester county, New York, during the American revolution. Morrisania, New York city, 1886.
vii,16,[2]p. fstnt.(port.)fold.maps. 29cm.

"Only 250 copies printed, in this form, each copy of which is numbered and signed by the author; No. 191".

65-1971

Shelf ICI 05

To

SAMUEL L. M. BARLOW, ESQ.,

OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK AND GLEN COVE, LONG ISLAND,

FOR A MEMORIAL OF THAT Past WHICH HE WILL REMEMBER

AND WHICH OTHERS CAN NEVER FORGET,

THIS WORK IS GRATEFULLY INSCRIBED

BY ITS AUTHOR.

MORRISANIA, NEW YORK CITY,
August 16, 1886.

PREFATORY NOTE.

The history of the County of Westchester, in New York, during the period commencing with the Spring of 1776 and closing with the early Winter of 1783, contains more of general interest than can be found in the history of any other County in the United States, during the same period, that of Suffolk, in Massachusetts and that of New York, in New York, not excepted.

No one who has hitherto pretended to speak or to write of the grand old agricultural County of Westchester, as a County, during the revolutionary era, has done more than to mention, with more or less of precision and particularity, the movements of two adverse Armies over her highways and her cultivated fields, one of them from Kingsbridge to the White Plains, the other from the Sound to the same objective point; the skirmish which has been dignified with the name of a Battle, which ensued; the ridiculous military spectacle of the two antagonistic Armies retreating from the White Plains, in opposite directions, and in the presence of each other; the half dozen military raids, sometimes from one of the belligerents and sometimes from the other, by whom the unarmed and entirely defenceless and previously plundered farmers were subsequently harassed and plundered, again and again; the *denouement* of a very serious defection and plot, the latter discovered within that County; the union of the allied forces of France and the United States, previous to that celebrated movement to the Southward which resulted in the capture of Lord Cornwallis and his command; and the escort duty which was performed by a Troop of Westchester-county Cavalry, when General Washington and Governor Clinton and their respective suites entered the City of New York, the closing military movement of the War of the American Revolution. All these have been told, over and over again, with more or less of precision and particularity, and with mechanical uniformity of order and general statements; but all these various writers, from Gordon and Ramsey to the younger Bolton and Ridpath, have successively and uniformly belittled the history of that community of industrious and peaceful and prosperous and conservative farmers, who occupied what was known, geographically, as the County of Westchester, during the ten years which are now under consideration, a history which consisted, in truth, of vastly more than a series of military movements and the providential detection of a military defection and plot; and it has consequently been left to other hands and to other pens, to do, with greater labor and less satisfaction, what should have been done, many years since, while the material was more abundant and more procurable, and while some, at least, of the actors in that great drama were here, to afford their more intelligent assistance.

An attempt has been made, in this work, to do a small portion of what has been, thus, hitherto, neglected; and if we shall have succeeded in the little which we have earnestly and laboriously attempted to do, the reader will find, therein, a brief, but honestly told, record of those influences, obtruded from beyond the County itself, without invitation from and in known opposition to the inclinations of those who were within the County, which, during the earlier revolutionary era, transformed a well-cultivated and highly productive agricultural region into one over which, without the baleful assistance of a foreign enemy, were spread, by fellow-colonists and fellow-subjects, the sickening evidences of obtruded and unwelcome partisan bitterness and relentlessness, presented in the devastation and waste and desolation which, everywhere throughout the County, then prevailed—of those influences, wielded by those who are unduly claimed to have been patriotic and virtuous, which carried with them, into the quiet and peaceful homesteads of agricultural Westchester-county, persecution and outrage and barbarism, such as the world has seldom seen, since the restraining power of Christianity has prevailed over those who, if left to themselves, as in the instances of those of whom we write, would have been only ruthless barbarians, notwithstanding the habiliments of civilization in which they sometimes appeared. We have endeavored to trace those evil influences, back, to their origin, and forward, as far as we have been able to go, to their final sad results; and, in more than one instance, we have seen those who controlled and wielded those influences, climb over the shattered remains of what, before, had been intelligent and industrious and contented families, and peaceful and plentifully-supplied homes, and productive farms, from the scenes of plunder and devastation and general ruin, of misery and hopelessness and woe, in which they had been the principal actors, to those high places of honor and emolument and power to which they had aspired and for the attainment of which they had not hesitated to bring all that wretchedness and ruin on others, to which we have alluded.

We have endeavored to present a complete history of the political as well as of the military affairs of Westchester-county, from the organization of the first political body, the Committee of Fifty-one, in the City of New York, by whom, in May, 1774, the first attempt was made to draw the farmers of Westchester-county into the vortex of revolutionary politics, until, early in December, 1776, the remarkable spectacle was presented to the world of two antagonistic Armies turning their backs on each other and retreating, in opposite directions, without the slightest attempt at pursuit, by either—circumstances over which we could not exercise any control having prevented a continuation of the narrative to the close of the War of the Revolution, as we originally designed to have done, we could do no more than that—and, whatever may have been the measure of our success, in the work which we have undertaken to do, as far as we have done it, we have been actuated, in all which we have written, by nothing else than by an earnest desire to ascertain the exact truth of every subject to which we have directed the reader's attention; to present the truth, thus ascertained, faithfully and fearlessly; and, as far as our strength and resources and ability should permit, to present to the descendants of those farmers of Westchester-county of whom we were particularly writing, something which, in the absence of anything better fitted for that purpose, should serve as a memorial of the sufferings to which their ancestors were subjected, by their own countrymen more than by those of foreign countries and quite as much while an armed foe was unknown throughout the Colony as while the tramp of opposing Armies was heard throughout the County. Notwithstanding all its defects, therefore, we trust the volume which contains the results of our prolonged and earnest labor, and which is, now, laid before the reader, will be accepted as our humble offering to the memory of those farmers and farmers' wives and farmers' children, residents of the County of Westchester, during the era of persecution and outrage and lawless violence, 1774–'83, and during the era of War and its barbarous accompaniments, 1776–'83, who were subjected to and who endured the outrages and barbarities of which we have made mention; and if, at the same time, it shall serve as a contribution to the general history of the County, the measure of our satisfaction will have been completed.

In the prosecution of our authorial labors, we have generally depended on the resources of our own work-library; but we have been favored with loans of half a dozen volumes which were not on our shelves, by Colonel J. Thomas Scharf, LL.D., of Baltimore, and Smith Williamson, Esq., of this City; and the files of local Newspapers, in the Library of the New York Historical Society, have, also, been usefully resorted to—for the use of all these, our sincere thanks are due, and, hereby, tendered. Messrs. William and Robert Kelby, of the New York Historical Society, have kindly made examinations and copies of papers for us, when we were unable to do so for ourself: our valued friends, Hon. J. O. Dykman and Hon. Lewis C. Platt, of the White Plains, and William Heathcote De Lancey, Esq., of the City of New York, have given their valuable assistance in determining and describing localities, in Westchester and Pelham and in the vicinity of the White Plains, which were the scenes of military operations described in our narrative: to the Rev. E. Edwards Beardsley, D.D., LL.D., of New Haven, we are indebted for the use of trustworthy material, concerning the raid on East Chester and West Chester, by banditti from Connecticut, which, but for his kindness and assistance, we would have been obliged to have used at second hand and in untrustworthy forms: our valued friend, Edward F. de Lancey, Esq., has been unwearied in answering our many questions and in affording us the benefits of his valuable suggestions and advice, for the improvement of our work: and our very dear friend, Professor Charles J. Little, LL.D., of the Syracuse University, has, also, employed his ripe scholarship and acute critical abilities in suggesting changes and additions where such changes and additions were desirable, in the presentation of the results of our studies or for the further instruction of the reader—to each and every one of these, we return our most grateful acknowledgments. There is one other whom we cannot forget, in this connection, our very dear friend and family physician, R. Heber Bedell, M.D., of Tremont, in this City, without whose untiring watchfulness of our very delicate health, with God's blessing on his labors, during the many months of feebleness and pain with which we have been afflicted, while employed in the preparation of this work and until this time, we could not possibly have completed so much of what we had undertaken to do: to him, for that almost filial attention to our health and comfort, during what has been the most trying labor of our authorial life, we gladly record our very great obligations and our heartfelt gratitude.

HENRY B. DAWSON.

MORRISANIA, NEW YORK CITY,
August 16, 1886.

WESTCHESTER-COUNTY, NEW YORK,

DURING

THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION.

WESTCHESTER COUNTY.

During the entire period extending from the first settlement which was made by Europeans, within that portion of New Netherland which, subsequent to the first of November, 1683, was known as the "COUNTY "OF WESTCHESTER," in New York, until within the memory of living men, the inhabitants of that portion of the country, with rare exceptions, were either cultivators of its soil or employed in other occupations which were, then, necessary for the comfort and well-being of such a purely agricultural community.[1]

A very large proportion of those farmers, however, especially during the earlier Colonial period, was not composed of owners, in fee-simple, of the soil which they cultivated, that having been held, in such instances, on Leases from the Lords of the several Manors into which the County was largely divided;[2] but those Leases were generally for long terms of years, on easy terms of rental, with liberal provisions for renewals; and those who held them were seldom disturbed in their continued and quiet possession of their respective properties.[3]

---

[1] "The Inhabitants indeed live all upon their own; but are generally "poor."—*Rev. John Bartow to the Venerable Society*, "WESTCHESTER IN "NEW YORK PROVINCE, 4th Nov., 1702."

"The people of this County, having generally land of their own, al-"though they dont want, few or none of them much abound."—*Colonel Caleb Heathcote to the Venerable Society*, "MANOR OF SCARSDALE, Nov. "9, 1705."

In 1711, Rev. John Bartow wrote to the Venerable Society, from Westchester, which was, then, the County-seat and principal Village: "The "Inhabitants of our Parish live scattered and dispersed up and down in "the Woods, so that many cannot repair constantly to the Church, by "reason of their great distance from it." *Quoted by Mr. Bolton*, History of Westchester County, *Second edition*, *i.*, 340. The "Parish" referred to, included, then, the more recent Towns of Westchester, West Farms, Morrisania, Kingsbridge, Yonkers, East Chester, Pelham, and New Rochelle.

See, also, *the letters of Rev. Robert Jenney to the Venerable Society*, "RYE, Dec. 15, 1722;" *Rev. John Bartow to the Bishop of London*, "WEST-"CHESTER, IN THE PROVINCE OF NEW YORK, IN AMERICA, July 13, 1724;" *Rev. Robert Jenney to the same*, "AT RYE, IN THE PROVINCE OF NEW "YORK, July 18, 1724;" *Rev. Peter Stoupe to the Venerable Society*, "NEW ROCHELLE, Dec. 11, 1727;" *Rev. James Wetmore to the same*, "RYE, February 20, 1727-28;" *etc.*

"As the people of this Country are all farmers, they are dispersed up "and down the Country; and even in Towns every one has a plott of at "least ten acres, which distances his neighbor from him."—*Rev. Thomas Standard to the Venerable Society*, "WESTCHESTER, Nov. 5, 1729."

See, also, *letter of Rev. James Wetmore to the Venerable Society*, "RYE, "March 2[illegible], 1742;" *The Parish of Rye to the same*, "PROVINCE OF NEW "YORK, RYE, March 6, 1744;" *Rev. Joseph Lampson to the same*, "NORTHCASTLE, IN THE PARISH OF RYE, February 19, 1746-47;" *Rev. Ebenezer Dibble to the same*, "STAMFORD IN CONNECTICUT, IN NEW ENG-"LAND, March 25, 1761;" *Rev. Harry Monro to the same*, "PHILIPS-"BURGH, February 1, 1766;" *Rev. Epenetus Townsend to the same*, "SALEM, WESTCHESTER COUNTY, March 25, 1771;" *etc.*

In 1811, Rev. Timothy Dwight, President of Yale-college, passed through Westchester-county, and wrote, of the Town of Eastchester, except "a small scattered Village," "the rest of the Township is covered "with plantations"—*Travels*, iii., 486—and, of the Town of Mamaroneck, "it is wholly a collection of plantations; and can scarcely be said to "contain even a hamlet. It is set, however, with a number of good houses "and excellent farms."—*Ibid*, iii., 487.—Of the County, as a whole, he wrote thus: "It is universally settled, so far as the nature of the "ground will admit; and is almost merely a collection of Farms."—*Ibid*, iii., 489.

We have resorted, also, to our own recollections of Westchester-county, which extend far beyond that day when the quiet and the morals of the County were first disturbed by the rush of a train of railroad-cars and the screeching of a locomotive, within its territory.

[2] In the Autumn of 1769, it was stated in the Assembly that the Manors of Philipseborough and Cortlandt, exclusive of all other portions of the County, contained "one-third of the people in the County;" but the number of Freeholders was somewhat increased, during the later Colonial period, as it was the practice of the greater number of the Proprietors to sell the fee-simple, whenever it was applied for.—*Edward F. de Lancey to Henry B. Dawson.*

[3] An instance of the permanence of occupation, by tenants on the Manors, is seen in the case of the Anjevines, thus referred to by Mr. Bolton: "Under the Heathcotes and De Lanceys, the Anjevines held "the large farm," [*in Scarsdale*,] "bearing their name, now owned by "Alexander M. Bruen, M.D., for four Generations."—*History of Westchester County*, second edition, ii., 231.

Although the Manors of Livingston and Rensselaerwyck and the Scott and Elenheim and Dunnesburg and Clark and Kortright and Hardenburg and Desbrosses and Livingston and Montgomery and Armstrong and Banyar and Hunter and Overing and Lewis and Verplanck and other Patents were not in Westchester-county, the relations of landlord and tenant were the same, unless in the rentals, in all; and they were the same as those which generally prevailed on the Manors and other large estates, in Westchester-county. The student who shall desire to learn more on that subject of American feudalism, as it existed before and since the American Revolution, may find very much which will be useful to him, in the *Report on the Difficulties existing between the Proprie*

With the exception of the frequently seen Gristmills and Sawmills and an occasional Fullingmill,[1] the aggregate amount of whose manufactured products did not generally exceed the demands of the several neighborhoods in which they were respectively situated, there were no Manufactories of any kind, within the County; and those who owned and ran the Mills to which we have referred, when those Mills were not owned and managed in the interest of the Lords of the Manors in which they were respectively seated,[2] more frequently than otherwise, were also occupants and cultivators of adjacent farms. The Blacksmiths and the Wheelwrights, the Masons and the Carpenters, the Tailors and the Shoemakers, the Storekeepers on the roadside and the Tavernkeepers on the corners, all of them reasonably regarded as peculiarly necessary portions of every rural community, were, very often, in this, also farmers on a smaller scale.[3] The Market-sloops which, then, made their periodical trips between the many landing-places, on the North-river or on the Sound, and the neighboring City, affording the only means, unless those which were supplied by teams, for the transportation of passengers and freight, which the County then possessed, were generally owned, wholly or in part, by well-to-do farmers living in the vicinity of the landing-places from which they respectively sailed; and, not unfrequently, those Sloops were navigated by younger members of their owners' families or by the young sons of some of their neighbors, of whom one, in every instance, discharged the double duty of "Captain" and Marketman.[4] Even the little Villages which were, then, scattered over the County, some of them made famous in the history of the world because of notable events which have occurred near them, were inhabited, principally, by those aged or more than usually wealthy people—the greater portion of them also cultivators as well as owners of neighboring farms—whose more abundant means enabled them to spend their days, more agreeably than on their own farms, in the enjoyment of the greater social privileges afforded in a country village life.[5] In short, as was said in the beginning, there were few, among the residents of that portion of the country, during the later Colonial period, who were not either actual cultivators of the soil or in some way connected with or dependent on those who were thus employed.

With a more than usually productive Soil, not yet exhausted by a vicious system of cultivation; with a temperate Climate, which was not only conducive to healthfulness, in the inhabitants, but promotive of the best interests of the farmers, in the ripening and harvesting of their crops; with moderate Rentals for the properties held by those of them who were not Freeholders; and with Taxes which were only nominal in amount; too far removed from the frontier to be harassed by the inroads of hostile Savages; and near enough to the not distant City to enjoy the great advantages which it afforded, in a constant Market, at the highest prices, for all the surplus products of their farms which they should desire to sell, and, at the lowest prices, for whatever, of necessities or of luxuries, the products of this or of other countries, which they should desire to buy—in the enjoyment of all these, the farmers of Westchester-county, especially during the later Colonial period, were favored as few other purely agriculturists have been favored, then or since, in any part of the world.

With rare exceptions, these Westchester-county farmers were intelligent men, sufficiently educated for all the purposes of their business and of their recreation—even among the earlier of the several Towns, those farmers included, in their Westchester-county homes, men and women of culture, whose names, and characters, and abilities, as scholars and statesmen, in several instances, are matters of history, known throughout the world:[6] while the intelligence of those of later Colonial period is seen in the multitude of ecclesiastical and political papers, signed by large numbers of them, and rarely disfigured by the "marks" of those signers which have always been apologetic of the illiteracy of those who have thus used them. There were very few among them, during the latter days of the Colony, who were not temperate, industrious, and prudent in the management of their farms and their business affairs; they were commonly very mindful of their duties to their families and of those to their neighbors; and they were generally diligent in the discharge of at least their outward duties to God. During the period last referred to, not many among them were not in comfortable circumstances: many of them were what is called "well-to-do:" some of them, particularly those who were members of the older families, in those days of simple habits, were considered wealthy. All of them were

tors of certain Leasehold Estates and their Tenants, presented to the Assembly of New York, in 1846, and reproduced, with an introductory Note, in *The Writings and Speeches of Samuel J. Tilden*, edited by John Bigelow, i., 186.

[1] The notorious Captain Cornelius Steenrod was the proprietor of more than one Fulling-mill, in Cortlandt Manor, at the opening of the War of the Revolution.

[2] The old Mill, on the Pocantico, near the ancient Manor-house of the Philipses, is a notable example of a Manorial Mill, continued until our own day.

[3] "Their employment is husbandry, even Inukeepers, Shopkeepers, "Smiths, and Shoemakers not excepted; so that we pray, pay, and "wait too, for everything done in this Country."—*Rev. Thomas Standard to the Venerable Society*, "WESTCHESTER, Nov. 5, 1729."

Within the period of our own recollection, this primitive combination of occupations was widely continued; and every one who is acquainted with the County, now, can readily call to mind more than one instance still existing.

[4] The personal recollections of members of our own family, extending further back than our own, afford ample authority for this statement.

[5] "Even in Towns every one has a plott of at least ten acres, which "distances his neighbor from him."—*Rev. Thomas Standard to the Venerable Society*, "WESTCHESTER, Nov. 5, 1729."

[6] Mrs. Anne Hutchinson, of Pelham, Adriaen Van der Donck, of Yonkers, and Colonel Caleb Heathcote, of Mamaroneck, may be referred to, in this connection.

noted for their open-handed hospitality; but, among the older and more wealthy families, whose fields, and barnyards, and granaries, and storerooms were generally teeming with all the comforts and many of the luxuries of life, the sturdy farmer and his tidy wife, his healthful children and his faithful negroes, vied in their efforts to secure to the acceptable guests of the family, a hearty welcome; to make the stay of those sojourners agreeable; and, when the time for their departure had come, to induce them to regret the shortness of their visit. Where the necessaries and comforts of life were so abundant and so generally enjoyed, Pauperism was comparatively unknown; and where Pauperism and Intemperance were so uncommon, there was a minimum of Crime.[1]

Especially during the Colonial period, there was no Village, at the County-seat or elsewhere, within the County, which contained a population sufficiently numerous to supply the neighboring farmers, nor even its own inhabitants, with the current news of the day;[2] nor was there any settlement, within the County, which possessed sufficient influence to lead the fashions of the wives and daughters of those farmers. There was not, therefore, nor could there have been, any central coterie or clique, with lofty pretentions and extended ambition, to prompt the County, in what should be said or done by its inhabitants, in support of or in opposition to any proposition, whether moral, or ecclesiastical, or political; nor was there any influence, in any one or in any number, sufficient to associate and organize those farmers, for any purpose whatever. Every one was dependent on his own resources and on his roadside or fireside chats with his neighbors, for whatever information he acquired concerning the passing events of that eventful period; he was dependent, mainly, on his own intelligence and his own intellectual powers, for whatever opinions he entertained, on any subject; and, except on some extraordinary occasions, he was left, undisturbed, in all his relations, by any outside influence.[3]

Such a community as that which constituted the Colonial County of Westchester—a community of well-situated, intelligent, and well-to-do farmers, diligently and discreetly attending to its own affairs, without the disturbing influence of any Village or County coterie—has generally been distinguished for its rigid Conservatism, in all its relations; and such a community has always been more inclined to maintain those various long-continued, well-settled, and, generally, satisfactory relations, with more than ordinary tenacity, preferring, very often, to continue an existing inconvenience or an intangible wrong, to which it had become accustomed, rather than to accept, in its stead, the possibility of an advantage, indefinitely promised, in an untried and uncertain change. The tenure under which so many of those Westchester-county farmers held their lands, which did not permit them to enjoy the rights of Freeholders, at the Polls, had, from the beginning, removed that portion of the inhabitants of the County from the arena of politics, without having created any discontent; and, to a great extent, it had served, also, to increase that Conservatism, even in political affairs, which would have undoubtedly controlled even those who were Tenants, under any other circumstances. There is not, indeed, any known evidence of the existence, at any time, within the County, of any material excitement, among the great body of those farmers, on any subject;[4] and, consequently, there is very little, if any, evidence that the excitement of the earlier opposition to the Home Government, which had so seriously disturbed the peace of the neighboring City, as well as that of other Towns and Cities, on the seaboard, prior to the Summer of 1774, had found any active sympathy, in West-

[1] A personal examination of the Records of the County, preserved in the office of the Clerk of the County, at the White Plains, has revealed, to us, the significant fact that, although the Records of *Civil* Actions in the Court of Common Pleas, the Records of Roads, and other similar Records, from a very early period, have been carefully made in books provided for the purpose (in one instance, if in no more, one volume, by being reversed, has been made to serve for two distinct lines of Records) and as carefully preserved, the Records of *Criminal* Actions, in any and all the Courts, within the County, were not thus made in books, until long after the time of which we write—until long, very long, after the close of the peaceful and prosperous and happy period of the Colonial era—when the greater number and more important character of the *Criminal* Actions—until then too insignificant, in number and character, to entitle them to such a distinction, among the County Records—warranted, the first time, the employment of books in which to keep the Records of them.

If the rough Minutes of the Courts, in *Criminal* Actions, prior to 1787, were preserved, at all, they have all disappeared; and we feel justified in saying, as we have said, in the text, that where Pauperism and Intemperance were as uncommon as they were in Westchester-county, during the later Colonial period, there was, in consequence, a minimum of Crime.

[2] It is understood that there was no Newspaper established in Westchester-county, until about 1810, when one was published at Somers, and one at Peekskill.

[3] Except wherein our authorities for particular statements have been already given, we have depended, for what we have stated, in this and in the two other paragraphs which immediately precede this, on the knowledge which we have acquired, concerning Westchester-county, its inhabitants, and its history, from the numerous books and manuscripts and newspapers, bearing on those subjects, which have fallen into our hands and been examined by us, during more than forty years past; on the information, relating thereto, which was given to us, personally, in our earlier life, by aged natives of the County, some of them dear relatives, and one, if no more, whose personal recollections extended back, beyond the Declaration of Independence; and on what remained of the character and habits of its Colonial inhabitants, in those old families who continued to linger within the County, when we first knew it.

[4] We are not insensible of the discontent, among the tenantry on the Cortlandt Manor, which led a considerable number of them and of those who favored them, in April and May, 1766, to move down, as far as Kingsbridge, demanding a redress of grievances, and making serious threats against their Landlord; but it was only a local disturbance, reaching only to the limits of that single locality. It possessed no political significance whatever—it was grimly said of it, by a contemporary, "Sons of Liberty are opposers to these Rioters as they are of opinion "no one is entitled to Riot but themselves"—and it was promptly suppressed, without loss of either property or life. Those who are curious to know more of this outbreak of early "Antirenters," are referred to the *Journals of Captain John Montresor*, 361, 363; and to the Colonial Manuscripts of that period.

chester-county, beyond the very limited circles of those who had held public offices within the County, of those who had aspired to the honors and emoluments of office which they had not been able to secure, and of those very few who had assumed to be either socially or intellectually or pecuniarily above the general grade of those among whom they lived. Indeed, there had been no good reason for those farmers, comfortably situated on their inland homesteads, to take any particular interest in those struggles which, from an early period, the Boston, the Salem, the New York, or any other Ship masters and Merchants had been waging, for the protection of that long-continued and profitable "illicit trade," from which no benefit had ever accrued to any one beyond those who were thus noisily defying the well-known and reasonable Laws of the Country; and, in the more recently and more generally created political excitement, it had mattered very little to the thrifty housewives, in Westchester-county, from whose warehouses—whether from those of John Hancock and the revolutionary Merchants of Boston and New York, or from those of the Agents of the East India Company, in those ports—their teacups should be supplied, since the Tea which had been smuggled into the Colonies, in violation of law, by the former, was quite as expensive, and not always as well-flavored, as that which had been imported, legally and legitimately, by the latter. Now and then, it is true, those of these farmers who were Freeholders, had been engaged, among themselves, in a political contest between the friends of the De Lanceys and those of the Morrises, or between the supporters of the Van Cortlandts and those of the Philipses, all of them Westchester-county Landlords, for seats in the General Assembly of the Colony[1] or for some local object; but, beyond such merely local contests, they had never gone—the "Sons of Liberty" were not represented and had no correspondents, within that County.

It will be evident to every one, from what has been stated concerning Colonial Westchester-county and those who occupied it, that the purposes of this work, which is devoted especially to the history of that purely agricultural community, do not require us to notice the long-continued and ably-conducted struggle of parties, throughout the Colony, in which the Livingstons and the Morrises had been pitted against the De Lanceys and the Colonial and Home Governments; nor will it be necessary, for those purposes, that we shall present, in all their different phases, the antagonism of "the Merchants and Traders" of every family and party and sect, united only in that one opposition to the Colonial policy of the Home Government[2]—of "the Gentlemen in Trade," as they sometimes called themselves—within the several Towns and Cities on the Atlantic seaboard, to some of the long-established Laws of the Kingdom, as well as to those which had been enacted, since the close of the War with France and Spain, for the purpose of meeting the necessities of the Mother Country, occasioned by the enormous expenses of that eventful contest—the unfranchised Mechanics and Working-men of that period, within the Cities and Towns referred to[3] (sometimes, courted and caressed by those

[1] Doctor Sparks, in his *Life of Governeur Morris*, i., 20, told us of an "important cause in which that gentlemen was engaged," before the Courts, during the Colonial era—"that of a contested Election, in West-"chester-county, where he had Mr. Jay for an opponent." We are not told who the contending parties, in that action, were; but it is said, "it involved principles of evidence, questions about the right of "suffrage, as then exercised, and a complication of facts, local and gen-"eral, which give full scope for the display of legal knowledge and "forensic skill."

[2] It is proper for us to say that that opposition to the Colonial policy of the Home Government, as it was developed within the City of New York, overpowered every difference of family or of sect or of party which had been previously known; and that the De Lanceys and the Livingstons, the Churchman and the Dissenter, the Jacobin and the Georgian, for the purposes of that opposition and of whatever might be necessary to establish its power, became as one man—one in purpose, one in determination, one in action, one in everything.

[3] Inasmuch as frequent mention will be made, in this narrative, of these unfranchised Mechanics and Working-men, it is proper that, in this place, we should explain our meaning of the phrase, in order that the reader may not be misled, concerning it.

By the Act of May 8, 1699, it was provided that Representatives to the General Assembly "shall be chosen in every City, and County, and "Manor of this Province, who have Right to chuse, by People dwelling "and resident in the same Cities, Counties, and Manors; whereof, "every one of them shall have Land or Tenements improved to the "value of *Forty Pounds* in Free-hold, free from all Incumbrances, and "have possessed the same Three Months before the Test of the said "Writ" [*for an Election;*] "and they which shall be chosen, shall be "dwelling and resident within the same Cities, Counties, and Manors; "and such as have the greatest Number of them, who shall have Lands "or Tenements improved, to the Value of *Forty Pounds* in Free-hold, "free from all Incumbrances, as aforesaid, shall be returned by the "Sheriffs of every City, Counties, and Manors, Representatives for "the Assembly, by Indentures sealed betwixt the said Sheriffs and the "said Chusers, so to be made."—(*Laws of New York*, Chapter LXXIV., Section I., Livingston and Smith's edition, New-York: 1752, 29, 30; *the same*, Chapter LXXIV., Section I., Van Schaack's edition, New-York 1774, 28.)

By the Charter of the City of New-York, granted by Governor Dongan, in 1686, the Mayor and three or more of the Aldermen were authorised to make Freemen of the City from among certain specified classes, on the payment, in each instance, of Five Pounds, not an insignificant sum, at that early period.* No person could do business of any kind, within the City, unless he were a Freeman of the City; and as the Freedom of the City also vested in those who held it the Right to vote for Representatives of the City in the General Assembly, it will be seen that, within the City, the unfranchised were only those Freeholders who were not Freemen and whose Real Estate was encumbered with debt; those Freeholders whose inexpensive homes were not worth Forty Pounds—a large sum, for that period; those who labored for others, as Clerks, Journeymen, or Laborers; and those of that shiftless, characterless class, who encumbered the City of New York, during the Colonial Period, as similar classes continue to encumber every City, especially every Seaport, holding itself in constant readiness to join in any act of violence into which such as Alexander McDougal and Isaac Sears, of the period under consideration, shall incline to lead them.

In Westchester-county, the heirs and assigns of Stephanus Van Cortlandt having failed to exercise the privilege which had been given to the latter, as the Lord of the Manor of Cortlandt, of electing a Representative for that Manor in the General Assembly, that privilege was transferred, by the Act of June 22, 1734, to the body of the Freeholders resi-

* A complete list of those who were admitted to the Freedom of the City of New York, from 1743 until 1775, may be seen in the *Manual of the Corporation of the City of New York for* 1856, 477–502.

who had usually assumed to be their social and political superiors, in order to secure their sturdy assistance in the intimidation of the Government, and, at other times, unrecognized by those whom they had thus befriended, as if they possessed no Rights, in political matters, which the franchised well-born were required to respect) constituting, also, another and entirely independent factor in the political elements of that period, in each of the several Colonies, which, in its very important relations with the politics and the politicians of its day, must, also, be generally disregarded, in this place, because it, and its aspirations, and its doings, are not, generally, germain to the purposes of this work. To other hands, therefore, must be left the labor of describing, in detail, the bold and persistent opposition of "the Merchants "and Traders" to those long-established Navigation and Revenue Laws, which, by reason of a more honest administration of them, by those whom the commercial classes had not succeeded in corrupting with their accustomed bribes, had so seriously interfered with the very profitable "illicit trade"—that more elegant phrase which was used, and which continues to be used, to describe what, elsewhere and among less comely offenders, was and is called by the more expressive term of "SMUGGLING"—in which those "Merchants and Traders" had been so long and so profitably engaged:[1] and we can only glance, also, at that subsequently adopted system of intimidation which had been resorted to, by the same confederated mercantile offenders, under the guise of patriotism, but really for the promotion of their own selfish purposes, in their employment and direction of that other, less responsible and, not unfrequently, less respectable, populace, a marketable class which every large seaport can produce, sometimes in one manner and sometimes in another, quietly or violently, as had best answered the ends of those who had em-

sent on the Manor." (*Laws of New York*, Chapter DCVII., Section II., Livingston and Smith's edition, New York: 1752, 219, 220; *the same*, Chapter DCVII., Section II., Van Schaack's edition, New-York: 1774, 193, 194.) It will be seen, therefore, that none, except those who were Freeholders holding improved and unencumbered Real Estate worth Forty Pounds, agreeably to the Act of May 8, 1699, could vote, in Colonial Westchester-county; but, on the other hand, the Freeholders on the Manor possessed and, undoubtedly, exercised the Right to vote twice, at every such Election for Representatives to the General Assembly—that for the Representative for the Manor, under the Manorial Charter, and that for the two Representatives for the County, under the Statute, already mentioned. Of course, the great body of the Tenantry, no matter how valuable its Leaseholds might be; those whose humble homes were not worth, in each instance, Forty Pounds; and those whose Freeholds, of every value, which were encumbered by debts, had not the right of voting at the Polls.

The practical effect of that limitation of the Right of Franchise may be seen in the Returns of Elections. In the Election for Representatives for the City of New York, held on the seventeenth, eighteenth, and nineteenth of February, 1761, only fourteen hundred and forty-seven votes, including those of the Freemen of the City who were not, also, Freeholders, were cast.—(*The original Returns of the Inspectors*, in manuscript, owned by us.) In the Election for Representatives for the City of New-York, held on the seventh, eighth, and ninth of March, 1768, when an intense excitement prevailed and all known means for increasing its strength were resorted to, by each of the antagonistic parties, nineteen hundred and twenty-seven votes, including those of eight hundred and twenty-three Freemen who were not, also, Freeholders, were cast.—(*The original Returns of the Inspectors*, in manuscript, owned by us.) In the Election for Representatives for the City of New-York, held on the twenty-third, twenty-fourth, twenty-fifth, twenty-sixth, and twenty-seventh of January, 1769, when another very excited contest occurred, only fifteen hundred and twelve votes, including those of the Freemen who were not, also, Freeholders, were cast.—(*The Returns of the Inspectors*, original printed edition, owned by us.) In the Election for Deputies to the Provincial Convention by whom the Delegation from the City of New York to the second Continental Congress was to be elected, held on the fifteenth of March, 1775, nine hundred and eighty-eight votes, including those of the Freemen of the City who were not, also, Freeholders, were cast.—(Holt's *New-York Journal*, No. 1680, NEW YORK, Thursday, March 16, 1775; *Rivington's New-York Gazetteer*, No. 100, NEW YORK, Thursday, March 16, 1775;* Gaine's *New York Gazette: and the Weekly Mercury*, No. 1223, NEW YORK, Monday, March 20, 1775.)

We have found only one Return of an Election in Westchester-county, during the period of which we write; but that very completely illustrates our subject. In the Election for the first Governor of the new-formed State, in 1777, the aggregate of the votes cast in Albany, Cumberland, Tryon, Duchess, Ulster, and Westchester-counties, including those of the Freemen of the City of Albany, was only twenty-six hundred and forty-two.—(*Fragment of a General Return of Votes cast throughout the State—Miscellaneous Papers*, Volume xxxvii., in the office of the Secretary of State, at Albany.)

In 1783, when there was nothing to disturb the election, the entire vote of the State for Governor, less that of ten Precincts which was illegally cast, was only four thousand seven hundred and forty-seven.—(Hutchins's *Civil List and Forms of Government of the Colony and State of New York*, Edition of 1870, 75.)

From these facts, the reader will understand how completely the governmental power was concentrated in the hands of the wealthy and how little those who were not wealthy could control the Government under which they lived, during the Colonial era and that which succeeded it, until the second Constitution of the State, within our own recollection, broke the power of the aristocracy and made every white male adult, who was a permanent resident and a tax-payer, also a member of the State and a voter.

* Rivington said the aggregate vote was a thousand and seventy-two.

[1] "The dispute between Great Britain and America commenced in the "year 1764, with an attempt to prevent smuggling in America."—*A Collection of Interesting, Authentic Papers relative to the Dispute between Great Britain and America. 1764 to 1775.* London: 1777—commonly known as Almon's *Prior Documents*—3.

See, also, the following official announcement, which was published in *Parker's New-York Gazette; or, the Weekly Post-boy*, No. 932, NEW YORK, Thursday, November 13th, 1760, which tells the whole story:

"Custom-house, New-York, Nov. 11th, 1760.

"WHEREAS we are informed, that some of our Traders from Foreign "Ports, are now, and have been for some Time, hovering in the Sound "on the Coast, with the View, as it is supposed, clandestinely to discharge "their Cargoes; a Practice highly prejudicial to His Majesty's Interest, "to the Trade of Great-Britain, and inconsistent with that Duty, and "Gratitude we owe to our Mother Country, almost exhausted with "Taxes raised for our Support and Defence. And not less injurious to "the fair Trader; who having paid high Duties, cannot be supposed to "sell so cheap, as those that pay no Duties, and of Course must be great "Sufferers. That this has been the Case, and is like to be the Case "again, is notoriously known; and all for the sake of enriching a few "Smugglers: which together with that of supplying our Enemies with "Provisions,* will be an eternal Reproach to our Country. No good "Man therefore, nor good Citizen, it is to be hoped, will hesitate in "giving all the Discouragement in his Power, to such ignominious "Practices. Informations, openly, or privately will be thankfully re-"ceived, and gratefully, if required, rewarded, by

"THE OFFICERS OF HIS MAJESTY'S CUSTOMS."

* At that time, Great Britain was at War with France and Spain, to whose Colonies, in the West Indies especially, Provisions were taken, by the Colonial Merchants, in exchange for those Goods, of foreign growth and production, which they sought to smuggle into the British Colonies, on the Atlantic seaboard, as above stated.

ployed it, to resist the execution of the Stamp-Act, to prevent the landing of the East India Company's Tea, and to make other demonstrations of seeming popular approval or disapproval, on other subjects of public polity or of governmental policy, whenever the political or the pecuniary interests of those "Gentlemen in Trade" who had employed it, seemed to warrant the outlay of the means which had been required to produce a desired result: to our hand, meanwhile, can be assigned, of all the various important subjects comprising the political and military histories of the Colony or of the Continent, at all periods, only the description of those events, during the period of the American Revolution and that of the War which followed and established that political Revolution, which, in themselves or in the consequences arising from them, directly affected the peace, the happiness, or the interests of those who, during those eventful periods, were residents of the rural County of Westchester, in New York.

The urgent appeals with which the newspapers had been filled, year by year, and the inflammatory handbills which had been posted throughout the City, whenever the purposes of "the Merchants and "Traders" of the City of New York had required their powerful, but, sometimes, questionable, co-operation in opposing the Colonial policy of the Home Government, had gradually taught "the Inhabitants" of that City—as, on such occasions only, the unfranchised Mechanics and Workingmen were delicately called, by those who had thus resorted to them—with more or less thoroughness, concerning the personal and political "Rights of Man and of Englishmen," as those Rights had been defined, from time to time, by those "Merchants and Traders" or by their well-paid Counsel, for the promotion of the particular purposes of those more aristocratic gentlemen; and these "In-"habitants" had also learned, from all those varied teachings and from their own well-trained reflections, that the particular Rights which had been so earnestly and learnedly claimed by their high-toned neighbors, were not less the Rights of the unfranchised masses, and equally the birthright of their children. Little by little, therefore, under the leadership of, probably, not more than half a dozen shrewd and able and ambitious men, generally of higher social and political standing than themselves, these "In-"habitants" began to grow uneasy and insubordinate, if not radically revolutionary; and the confederated "Merchants and Traders" and the more aristocratic portion of the citizens who were not in Trade were as quickly made sensible that a power had been created and fostered, by themselves, for their own lawless purposes, which, because of its tendency towards a radical Revolution in both the social and political relations of the Colony, they were no longer able to control—a power, indeed, which, if it were not speedily and effectually checked, would surely overwhelm them and, probably, involve the Colony and the Continent in revolution and disaster. At the same time, it was clearly seen by those careful observers of the signs of the times, that any attempt to abridge the existing power of the unfranchised "Inhabitants" of the City, and, especially, that of those who were less scrupulous in the selection of their means, by open and direct measures, would, probably, induce the latter to employ, in their own behalf, that system of violence which they had been taught to regard as commendable and praiseworthy, when they had employed it in behalf of others; and it was seen, also, by those who had become alarmed by the strength and the audacity of that new element in Colonial politics, strengthened, as it evidently was, by its affiliation with the radically revolutionary elements in New England, the machinery of the by-gone Committees of Correspondence being controlled by it, that, in order to check its growing power, or to secure any change whatever, in the control of it, or to retain the control of the politics of the Colony, great caution and great tact, if not great promptness and great boldness, at some auspicious moment, would be absolutely necessary. An evident danger silenced those who, under other circumstances, would, probably, have favored the employment of other and more direct means: wise counsels prevailed among those who were thus considering in what manner the evidently rising power and audacity of the unfranchised and revolutionary masses could be controlled, without disturbing the peace of the City and the Colony: and it was determined, with much shrewdness, to resort to "art," at the earliest favorable opportunity, for the accomplishment of their well-concealed purposes.[1] Such an opportunity as was desired for the purposes referred to, was very soon afforded.

The tea-laden *Nancy*, Captain Lockyer, had been turned back to Europe, without having been permitted to enter the harbor;[2] the cargo of the *London*, Captain Chambers, had been overhauled, in Whitehall-slip, in open day, by men wearing no disguises; and eighteen chests of Tea, which had been concealed in her hold, had been emptied into the East-river;[3] and the populace was quietly reposing on the revolution-

[1] Although there is abundant evidence to support this statement, it has been so completely and so graphically presented by Gouverneur Morris, in a letter addressed to Mr. Penn, which will be printed, *in extenso*, on page 12-32, post, that no other is regarded as necessary, in this place.

[2] Holt's *New-York Journal*, No. 1633, NEW-YORK, Thursday, April 21, and No. 1634, NEW-YORK, Thursday, April 28, 1774; Gaine's *New-York Gazette and Mercury*, No. 1174, NEW-YORK, Monday, April 25, 1774; *Lieutenant-governor Colden to the Earl of Dartmouth*, "NEW YORK, 4th "May, 1774," *and the enclosure therein; the same to Governor Tryon*, "NEW "YORK, 4th May, 1774;" Dunlap's *History of the New Netherlands, Province of New York, and State of New York*, i., 452, 453; Leake's *Memoir of the Life and Times of General John Lamb*, 81-84; Dawson's *The Park and its Vicinity, in the City of New York*, 29-31; Graham's *History of the United States*, iv., 329; Hildreth's *History of the United States*, iii., 31; Gordon's *History of the American Revolution*, i., 322-324; etc.

[3] Holt's *New-York Journal*, No. 1634, NEW-YORK, Thursday, April 28, 1774; Gaine's *New-York Gazette and Mercury*, No. 1174, NEW-YORK, Monday, April 25, 1774; *Lieutenant-governor Colden to the Earl of Dartmouth*, "NEW-YORK, 4th May, 1774," *and the enclosure therein; the same to Gov-*

ary honors which, in the interest of the commercial classes, it had again secured.[1] The master-spirits of the confederated party of the Opposition—the Government and those who favored it having no part in that matter of division among those who were opposing its policy—were evidently sensible, however, as has been said, that that unseemly confederation of radically antagonistic elements, entirely for the promotion of the interests of one of those elements without securing a corresponding advantage to the other, was unnatural, and could not be lasting; and it was evident, also, to every one, that an open conflict between the conservative aristocratic and the revolutionary democratic elements of the population, without reference to matters of governmental policy, and only for the control of the political power, within the City and Colony, was likely to be commenced, at any moment.

Just at that critical period, in May, 1774, advices were received from Europe,[2] of the Government's proposal to close the Port of Boston, with a possibility that that of New York would shortly share the same fate; and it was also said that the Home Government also intended to remove the principal offenders against the Laws, within the Colonies, that they might be tried and punished in England.[3] With great tact and plausibility and a greater pretension to patriotism, the confederated "Merchants and Traders" and those who possessed their confidence promptly seized that much desired opportunity, for the accomplishment of their sinister purposes; and, with that end in view, they boldly and promptly occupied the place of leaders of the entire City and Colony, in protesting against those measures of the Home Government, and in providing for a systematic opposition to those measures, under their own particular direction, without, however, having recognized the existence or invited the co-operation of the respectable popular element, within the City, nor those of the very few who really represented and controlled that more unruly element of which mobs were composed, both of which omissions, the meaning of which was very evident, subsequently produced serious, if not unexpected and unwelcome, consequences.

For the purposes of the promoters of the proposed change in the leadership of the politicians of the City, to which reference has been made, "an *Advertisement*" was posted at the Coffee-house, in Wall-street, a noted place of resort for Shipmasters and Merchants, reciting "the late extraordinary and very alarming advices "from England;" and "inviting the Merchants to "meet at the house of Mr. Samuel Francis, on Mon-"day evening, May 16, in order to consult on mea-

---

ernor Tryon, "New York, 4th May, 1774;" Dunlap's *New York*, i., 452, 453; Leake's *Lamb*, 82-84; Dawson's *Park and its Vicinity*, 30, 31; Holbrook's *United States*, iii., 31.

Note the striking the greater significance of the opposition of New York to the Tea tax, which was seen in the resolute refusal to allow the return of the tea-ship *Nancy* to enter the harbor; in the examination of the cargo of the *London*, and the open destruction of her concealed Tea, in the night of May, by known men who saw no reason for disguising themselves; and in the return of the *Nancy*, to England, by the Committee who had taken possession of her, at Sandy Hook; it has been the custom of New England writers to withhold whatever of honor or dishonor there was in those doings of the party of the Opposition, in New York, while the less significant "tea-party" of Boston has been elaborately presented as a feat of great daring and of the highest grade of patriotism.

Thus, Mercy Warren (*History of American Revolution*;) "Paul Allen" (*History of American Revolution*;) Thacher (*Military Journal*;) Morse (*Annals of the American Revolution*;) Pitkin (*History of the United States*;) Frothingham (*Rise of the Republic*;) Lodge (*Short History of English Colonies*;) and a multitude of others, make no mention whatever of the subject of the opposition in New York; and Bancroft, in the octavo edition of his *History of the United States*, after alluding, in a dozen words, to the storm which had driven the New York tea-ship to the West Indies, very conveniently said no more on the subject—a suppression of the truth which he shabbily attempted to mitigate, in his centenary and "thoroughly revised" edition of that work, by an interpolation of five lines, nearly two of which have no relation whatever to the subject of New York's opposition to the tax; and nearly two others state, in connection with the *Nancy*, what every novice in the history of those times knows is entirely untrue, in one of its only two statements concerning her.

Strange to say, Lossing, a New York writer, with all the original material within his reach and perfectly accessible, in his *Seventeen hundred and seventy-six* (page 111,) stated that the *Nancy* was returned to Europe, only "because no one could be found that would venture to receive the "tea," without an allusion to her having been stopped at Sandy-hook, and returned, *thence*, to Europe; and, also, without the slightest allusion to the *London* and to what became of her tea. In his *History of the United States*, (page 221) all that appears, concerning either the *Nancy* or the *London* is that *they* "returned to England with their cargoes"; although the *Nancy* was the only one which thus returned, and then only because she was compelled to return. In his *Field Book of the Revolution*, after having devoted five pages to the Boston "Tea-party" (i., 497-502) he ventured to appropriate ten lines to the greatly more significant doings of New York, on the same subject.

[1] On the fifth of March, 1770, while the motion of Lord North for "leave to bring in a Bill to repeal the Tax Act, as far as related to the "tax on Paper, Glass, and Painters' Colours," was under consideration, before the House of Commons, Governor Pownall, than whom no one was, then, better informed on every subject connected with America and the Americans, replied to the Minister, and moved an amendment, to include Tea, also, in the proposed Bill.

In the course of his exceedingly important Speech, on introducing his motion to amend, the Governor said, "The drawback upon those "Teas, exported to America, of twenty-five per cent, does not amount, "as this argument supposes, to one shilling per pound—it amounts to "only sevenpence half-penny, or thereabouts—so that, did it operate as "a bounty, at all, it would amount to only fourpence half-penny. But "this is not material to the point; for it does not operate as a bounty, "at all, because whatever duty the East India Company pays, originally, "at the Custom-house, on the importing of Teas from Asia, that sum is "added to the price of their Tea, in their sales; so that, although the "exporter to America may be allowed a drawback, yet he draws back "that sum only which he hath already paid in the price of his purchase, "*by which means, on this article of supply now stands, there is an advantage "in favour of the Dutch Teas imported into the Colonies, against the British "Teas, of twenty-five per cent. difference.*"—(Debrett's *History, Debates, and Proceedings of both Houses of Parliament*, 1743 to 1774, v., 264.)

The reader will perceive, therefore, that the opposition to the importation of Tea, into America, with its parliamentary tax imposed on it, which the Merchants instigated and encouraged, in the seaports—the opposition was seen no where else than within the shadows of those ports—was composed less of "patriotism" than of love of pelf. *The Dutch Teas afforded a much larger profit; and a disturbance of that line of trade was not, therefore, desireable.*

[2] They were received on Thursday, May 12, by the *Samson*, Captain Couper, the latest ship from London.

[3] "*Extracts from private letters from London, dated April 7 and 8, to "persons in New York and Philadelphia*," printed on the backs of copies of the *Boston Port Bill*, and circulated, in broadside form, in New York, May 14, 1774.

"sures proper to be pursued on the present critical "and important occasion."[1]

It will be seen that no others than "the Merchants" of the City were invited to attend the proposed Caucus, at Sam. Francis's Long-room;[2] and that the published purpose was only "to consult on measures proper to "be pursued on the present critical and important "occasion," in neither of which features of the "Ad-"*vertisement*," *prima facie*, can it be reasonably said that any stretch of authority had been attempted by those who had called the proposed Caucus—surely, it will not be said there might not be *consultations*, among Merchants as well as among other classes of the citizens, on any subject whatever, especially on subjects in which they were especially interested, without interference from any other class; and it will hardly be pretended by any one, that, in the instance now under consideration, the Merchants of the City were not peculiarly interested in the subjects of "the "late extraordinary and very alarming advices from "England;" that they might not properly "consult," among themselves, "on measures proper to be pur-"sued on the present critical and important occa-"sion;" that, for the purpose of such a "consulta-"tion," they might not invite whomsoever they pleased, to meet at a place and time designated, without consulting with any other persons or asking permission from any others; and that such a Caucus, thus invited, might not be had, without any interference from any one. There was no appearance of deception in the "*Advertisement*" through which the Caucus had been invited, in the instance under consideration; and, subsequently, when the Caucus assembled, no attempt appears to have been made to do anything more than the "*Advertisement*" had authorized, notwithstanding those who had been specifically invited and were present, so largely outnumbered those uninvited intruders who opposed them, that any change from the terms of the "*Advertisement*" which they were inclined to make, could have been made—indeed, it appears to have been intended, by the Merchants, only for consultation and for the orderly preparation of measures to be submitted to the body of the inhabitants of the City, at a Meeting to be called for that purpose, for their approval or disapproval, without losing sight, however, of what was the real, substantial purpose of the movement. But those who had hitherto assumed to be the leaders of the unfranchised masses—the leaders, in fact, however, of only the radically revolutionary portions of those masses, —saw, or assumed to have seen, in that proposed Caucus, a movement which promised to break the hold on the unfranchised element which, since the era of the Stamp-Act, they had unceasingly claimed to have maintained;[3] and to transfer, to some extent, at least, some portion of the leadership of that uncertain and, sometimes, unruly element, in the political affairs of the Colony, to others; and Isaac Sears and his handful of kindred associates, with that audacious disregard of the unquestionable Rights of others which, subsequently, became so conspicuously notorious and oppressive, not only determined to thrust themselves into a Caucus to which they had not been invited, but to turn the action of that Caucus from the purposes of those who had called it, and to give to that action a character and direction which would be entirely foreign to the purposes for which the Caucus had been invited. The consequences of that proposed intrusion and the ill success of that scheme to oust those who had invited the Caucus and to turn into other channels than those which the latter had proposed, the action and influence of the Caucus itself, will be seen in the published narrative of the proceedings of that notable assemblage—meanwhile, it will be evident to every careful observer, that that separation of the radically antagonistic social and political elements which, united, formed, at that time, the

[1] *Minutes of the New York Committee of Correspondence*. Monday, May 19, 1774; *Lieutenant-governor Colden to Governor Tryon*, "SPRING HILL, "31st May, 1774;" *the same to the Earl of Dartmouth*, "NEW YORK, 1st "June, 1774;" *Governeur Morris to Mr. Penn*, "NEW YORK, May 20, "1774;" Jones's *History of New York during the Revolutionary War*, i., 34; etc.

[2] "Sam. Francis," at that time and during many years subsequently, was a noted *restaurateur*, known to and respected by every one, of every sect and party, in the City of New York, during the later Colonial period, during the entire War, and after the restoration of Peace.

"Francis's Tavern," where this Caucus was held, had been, at an earlier period, the residence of the De Lancey Family. It was built in 1701, by Etienne De Lancey, on a lot of ground which Stephanus Van Cortlandt had given to his daughter, Anne, when, in the preceding year, that lady was married to Mr. De Lancey; and it is still standing on the north-eastern corner of Broad and Pearl-streets, the oldest building in the City of New York.

"Francis's Long-room," in which this Caucus was held, subsequently became more famous than it had previously been, because it was the room in which the Officers of the Army of the Revolution assembled, on Thursday, the fourth of December, 1783, after the enemy had evacuated the City and the Peace had been entirely established, to take their final leave of their illustrious Chief; and from which, accompanied by his sorrowful friends—"a solemn, mute, and mournful procession, with "heads hanging down and dejected countenances"—he walked, directly, to Whitehall-slip, and was rowed, thence, to Powle's Hook, now Jersey City, on his way to Annapolis, to which place the Congress had adjourned, to resign the Command of the Army, with which he had been invested, in 1775.—(Gordon's *History of the War of the Revolution*, iv., 383, 384; Marshall's *Life of Washington*, (Phila. Edit.) iv., 619, 620; etc.)

It is proper to be said, in that connection, that Samuel Francis was "a man of dark complexion," probably a mulatto; that he was known, ordinarily, as, "Black Sam;" and that, when General Washington entered the City, on the twenty fifth of November, "he took up his head-"quarters at the Tavern" of that dusky landlord.—(Dunlap's *History of New York*, ii., 233, the author of which related these circumstances from his own personal knowledge of them.)

[3] The Meeting, at Burns's Coffee-house, on the evening of the thirty-first of October, 1765, for the adoption of measures to prevent the execution of the Stamp-Act, appointed a Committee of Correspondence, composed of Isaac Sears, John Lamb, Gershom Mott, William Wiley, and Thomas Robinson, to give better effect to its Resolutions, by securing harmonious action, thereon, throughout the entire Continent. The repeal of that obnoxious Statute, of course, rendered that appointment inoperative; but those who had constituted that Committee, with a half dozen associates, continued to exercise an authority and leadership, among the unorganized and manageable elements, in the City, until the opening of the War, in 1775, when several of those leaders secured offices, and ceased to be the "patriotic" leaders of those who, then, more than ever, needed intelligent leaders.

political conglomerate in which had been combined, for purely selfish purposes, the fragmentary opposition, in the Colony of New York, to the Home Government which was then in authority (each of those antagonistic elements being, in pretension, if not in fact, equally zealous in its loyalty to their common Sovereign) was produced by less of respect for [illegible] in politics and of a genuine patriotism than of thirst for individual gain to be derived, as was then supposed, from the internal control of the party of the Opposition and of what should be gained through it—just such a factional contest, within a party composed of radically discordant elements, united for purposes which had served to combine those elements into one body, indeed, as have been seen, very frequently, and such as may be seen, now, not only in New York, but in every other community in which such ill-formed parties are permitted to exist, and to intrigue, and to deceive.[1]

At the appointed hour, on Monday, the sixteenth of May, the Long-room, in Sam. Francis's Tavern,[2] was crowded with anxious and determined men, evidently not entirely of one mind, and not indisposed, in some instances, at least, to enforce whatever differences of opinion and purpose might arise, with something more tangible than words, should such an enforcement, in their opinion, become necessary.

Those whom the "*Advertisement*" had invited were present, in large numbers, and evidently well-prepared for harmonious and decisive action, limited only by the terms of the invitation; and there were present, also, in much smaller numbers, including some who were not "Merchants" and who had not been invited, those who assumed to be the leaders of the unfranchised masses, who had also secured harmonious action, among themselves, by previous factional consultation.[4] Isaac Low,[5] a prominent Merchant, was called to the Chair; and Resolutions were adopted, "by a great Majority," in each instance, *First*, that it was necessary, then, "to appoint a Committee to correspond with the neighbouring Colonies on the present important Crisis;" *Second*, that "a Committee be nominated, on that Evening, for "the Approbation of the Public;" and, *Third*, that the Committee consist of fifty persons.[6]

As the matter in dispute, between the two antagonistic factions, related only to the designation of those who should control the local politics of the day and what should be realized from those politics, it is not probable that any material opposition was made to the first and second of the three Resolutions which were adopted by the Caucus—none has been mentioned by any contemporary writer—but when the third was proposed, those who assumed to represent the unfranchised masses made an attempt to reduce the number from fifty to twenty-five, by which means they hoped to be able to control the action of the Committee, notwithstanding they were so few in number; but their proposed amendment to the original Resolution was promptly rejected, "by a great Majority."[7]

With very great good judgment, the majority of the Caucus evidently treated the minority with respectful consideration, notwithstanding the former steadily

[1] The reader need only turn to the history of existing political parties, held together by "the cohesive power of public plunder," for an illustration of the structure, the aims, and the policy of that confederated party of the Opposition, in Colonial New York, and of the factional struggle, within itself, for the control of its united action and, most of all, for that of the distribution of such "spoils" as, in case of the party's success, should fall into the hands of the "victors."

[2] We are not insensible of the fact that the Caucus is generally stated to have been held at the Exchange, which occupied the middle of Broad-street, nearly opposite the Tavern; and that an entry in the *Minutes of the Committee of Correspondence* stated, specifically, that it was held in that building. But it was called, in the original "*Advertisement*," very definitely, "to meet at the house of Mr. Samuel Francis;" in none of the contemporary descriptions of the Caucus which we have seen, was it said or intimated that the assemblage left the Tavern, for any purpose, before the formal adjournment of the Caucus; and in the second "*Advertisement*," published on the day after the Caucus, by its officers and under its authority, inviting the body of the inhabitants of the City to meet at the Coffee-house, to confirm or amend the official acts of that Caucus, it was said, in its description of that preliminary meeting, after [illegible] the fact that it was called "to meet *at the House of Mr. Samuel Francis*," that "a very respectable and large number of the Merchants and other Inhabitants did accordingly appear at the time and place appointed, and then and *there* nominated for the approbation of "the public, a Committee of fifty persons," etc. With these as our authorities, we prefer to differ from those who have preceded us; and to insist, as we do insist, that the Caucus was held, without interruption or removal, in Sam. Francis's Long-room.

For the reasons stated, we prefer to differ, also, from our friend, Edward F. de Lancey, who has stated, in his carefully prepared *Notes* to Jones's *History of New York during the Revolutionary War* (ii., 338, 339) that the Caucus was held in "the Exchange, to which place it adjourned "from Francis's Tavern, where it was called, on account of the great "attendance."

[3] Compare the terms of the "*Advertisement*" calling the Caucus, "inviting *the Merchants* to meet," etc., with the official description of those who had been present at that Caucus, which was contained in the published call for the meeting at the Coffee-house, to confirm or amend the doings of that Caucus—"a very respectable and large number of the "*Merchants and other Inhabitants* did accordingly appear."

[4] A small broadside, containing a list of twenty-five names of persons who were "nominated by a Number of respectable Merchants and the "Body of Mechanics of this City, to be a Committee of Correspondence "for it, with the Neighboring Colonies," may be seen in the Library of the New York Historical Society. It was evidently the result of a consultation of those who assumed to have been the leaders of the masses of the unfranchised inhabitants of the City.

It is a noticeable fact, however, that that list of nominees, with only three of the names stricken from it, was incorporated in the larger list which was nominated by the Caucus.

[5] "Low belonged to the Church of England, a person unbounded in "ambition, violent and turbulent in his disposition, remarkably obsti-"nate, with a good share of understanding, extremely opinionated, fond "of being the head of a party, and never so well pleased as when "Chairman of a Committee or principal spokesman at a mob meeting. "His principles of government inclined to the republican system."—(Jones's *History of New York during the American Revolution*, i., 35.)

Mr. Low, subsequently, became a Loyalist; was stripped of his property, by confiscation; was attainted; and retired to England, where he died in 1791.—(Sabine's *Biographical Sketches of Loyalists of the American Revolution*, original edition, 439;—*the same*, second edition, ii., 32, 33.)

[6] *Proceedings of the Caucus*, printed on a broadside, for general circulation, a copy of which is in the Library of the New York Historical Society.

[7] *Proceedings of the Caucus*, original edition; de Lancey's *Notes* to Jones's *History of New York*, i., 439; Leake's *Memoir of General John Lamb*, 87; Dawson's *Park and its Vicinity*, 34; Bancroft's *United States*, original edition, vii., 41, 42; *the same*, centenary edition, iv., 326, 327.

maintained its own ground and voted down every attempt to oust it, which was made by the latter; and in making the nomination of the fifty whom it proposed for the Committee of Correspondence, it did no more than to drop the names of three of those whom the minority had already selected, as its proposed Committee of Twenty-five, and to slip into the list of the twenty-two who were retained, without breaking the order in which they had been arranged on the original list, the names of twenty-eight other persons with whom the promoters of the Caucus were better pleased—as nearly the entire minority was included in the list of nominees, giving it a small share of the responsibilities and of the honors or dishonors of the proposed Committee, its opposition to the action of its aristocratic and conservative opponents appears to have ceased; and the establishment of the proposed Committee of Fifty, by the body of the inhabitants, was, thereby, assured.

It appears to have been a part of the plan of those who had called and controlled the Caucus, to submit the result of its deliberations to the body of the inhabitants of the City, for its consideration and approval; and nothing had occurred, within the Caucus, to make any change in that plan necessary. Accordingly, on the day after the meeting of the Caucus [*Tuesday, May* 17] they published a Card, addressed "To the Public," in which "the Inhabitants "of this City and County" were "requested to attend "at the Coffee-house, on Thursday, the 19th instant, "at 1 o'clock, to approve of the Committee nominated "as aforesaid, or to appoint such other persons as, in "their discretion and wisdom, they may seem meet."[1]

Notwithstanding the meeting at the Coffee-house was called at one o'clock, an hour when every Mechanic and Laborer would probably be employed in his daily labor, it is said that "a great concourse of "the Inhabitants" assembled at that place,[2] at the appointed time, [*Thursday, May* 19, 1774, *at one o'clock;*] and we are also told that the assemblage was addressed by Isaac Low, who was in the Chair; that some discussion arose, which resulted in the addition of Francis Lewis to the proposed Committee, increasing the number of that Committee to fifty-one; and that, the unfranchised masses having been placated by the addition of another of their leaders to the proposed Committee of Correspondence, the entire list of nominees was confirmed, without farther opposition.[3]

[1] Advertisement "To the Public," calling the Meeting at the Coffee-house, dated "NEW-YORK, Tuesday, May 17, 1774," copied into the *Minutes of the Committee of Correspondence.*

See, also, the same Advertisement and an editorial note thereon, in Holt's *New-York Journal*, No 1637, NEW-YORK, Thursday, May 19, 1774; and *Rivington's New-York Gazetteer*, No. 57, NEW-YORK, Thursday, May 19, 1774; Gaine's *New York Gazette and Mercury*, No. 1178, NEW-YORK, Monday, May 23, 1774; *Lieutenant-governor Colden to Governor Tryon*, "SPRING-HILL, 31st May, 1774;" *the same to the Earl of Dartmouth*, "NEW-YORK 1st June 1774;" Drake's *Memoir of General John Lamb*, 87; Dawson's *Park and its Vicinity*, 33; etc.

[2] "The Coffee-house," that place which was so frequently mentioned in the commercial as well as in the political affairs of the City, stood on the southeastern corner of Wall and Water-streets, opposite the "Slip" which bore its name.

Mr de Lancey, in his *Notes on Jones's History* (i., 430) says it was on the "southeast corner of Wall and Pearl Streets;" but he was certainly in error. Stevens, in his *Progress of New York in a Century*, 1776–1876, 25, correctly described the site of the old "Merchants' Coffee-house."

[3] *Minutes of the Committee of Correspondence;* Holt's *New-York Journal*, No. 1638, NEW-YORK, Thursday, May 26, 1774; Gaine's *New-York Gazette and Mercury*, No. 1178, NEW-YORK, Monday, May 23, 1774; *Lieutenant-governor Colden to Governor Tryon*, "SPRING-HILL, 31st May "1774;" *the same to the Earl of Dartmouth*, "NEW-YORK, 1st June 1774;" *History of the War in America*, (Dublin: 1779) i., 22; Dunlap's *New York*, i., 453; Hildreth's *United States*, First Series, iii., 35; Bancroft's *United States*, original edition, vii., 42, 43; Frothingham's *Rise of the Republic*, 327; Bancroft's *United States*, centenary edition, iv., 327, 328; Sparks's *Life of Gouverneur Morris*, 22–26; Dawson's *Park and its Vicinity*, 33.

Notwithstanding the important results which the appointment of that Committee of Correspondence produced, it was not even alluded to by Stedman, (*History of the American War*;) Mercy Warren, (*History of the American Revolution*;) Morse, (*Annals of the American Revolution*;) Pitkin, (*History of the United States*;) Lossing, (*Seventeen hundred and seventy-six*; *History of the United States*, edition of 1857; and *Field-book of the Revolution*;) and many others.

Judge Jones, (*History of New York, during the Revolutionary War*, i., 34) supposed the "Committee was chosen," at the Caucus, at Sam. Francis's: and made no allusion to the Meeting at the Coffee-house, where it "was chosen." Doctor Gordon, (*History of American Revolution*, London: 1788, i., 261, 262,) said the Caucus was called by Sears, McDougal, and others of the popular party, so called: that "the Tories," or governmental party, opposed them, in the Caucus; that Sears secured the appointment of a fifty-second member of the Committee; and that the whole subject was disposed of by the Caucus. He made the minority of the Caucus, the victors; and did not allude to the Meeting at the Coffee-house. Doctor Ramsay, (*History of the American Revolution*, London: 1791, i., 114,) said "the Whigs and Tories were so nearly balanced "in New-York, that nothing more was agreed to at the first meeting of "the inhabitants," [*after the receipt of the Boston Port-bill*] "than a "recommendation to call a Congress," although, in truth, the subject of a Congress was not even alluded to, at either the Caucus or the Coffee-house. "Paul Allen," (*History of the American Revolution*, i., 186) said, "At New York, there was a considerable struggle between the friends "of Administration and the friends of Liberty; but the latter at length "prevailed, by the influence and management of two individuals, who "had, on several occasions, manifested great activity and zeal, in their "opposition to the obnoxious measures of the Ministry," although, in truth, the friends of the Government took no part whatever in the politics of that particular period; and the conflict was only between rival factions of the same party of the Opposition to the Government, each contending for the control of that particular party, while both professed to be equally opposed to the Government. It is also true that those to whom this author referred, as the prevailing faction, were the minority, were outvoted and in every other respect were entirely defeated. Grahame, (*History of the United States*, London: 1836, iv., 349,) said, "At New "York the members and activity of the Tory party restrained the As-"sembly and the people at large from publicly expressing their senti-"ments with regard to the treatment of Massachusetts;" although, in truth, the friends of the Home Government were, then, so greatly in the minority that they did nothing whatever to restrain the popular feelings; while the utterances of both the Committee of Correspondence and the General Assembly were as unequivocally antagonistic to the Home Government's Colonial policy, as anything which appeared elsewhere. He made no allusion whatever to either the Caucus or the Meeting at the Coffee-house. Hildreth (*History of the United States*, First Series, iii., 35) said that the old Committee of the "Sons of Liberty" "was dissolved and a new one elected," without alluding to either the Caucus or the Meeting at the Coffee-house; although, in fact, the Committee of Correspondence of an early date had ceased to exist when the Stamp-Act was repealed; and neither that nor any other Committee was alluded to, in the slightest degree, during the proceedings now under consideration; notwithstanding those who had composed the Committee, in their individual capacities, in many instances, are known to have participated in both the Caucus and the Meeting at the Coffee-house. Bancroft (*History of the United States*, original edition, vii., 41; *the same*, centenary edition, iv., 326) made "the old Committee" of "the Sons of

By the direct action of the body of the inhabitants of the City, thus duly called, and assembled at the Coffee-house, for that specific purpose, all the discordant elements of the party of the Opposition to the Home Government, in New York, were seemingly consolidated and placed under the leadership of the Committee of Fifty-one, which was, then and there, appointed for that ostensible purpose; and those who had taken alarm at the growing audacity of those who were assuming to be the leaders of the unfranchised masses, were gratified with ample evidence of the fact that the well-considered "art" which those who had planned the Caucus at Sam. Francis's and the Meeting at the Coffee-house had employed, in order to check the rising pretensions and power of the working, revolutionary multitude, in political affairs, had been crowned with an abundant success. There had been, indeed, a display of wise caution and great tact, as well as of well-concealed duplicity, in all which had been done by those aristocratic, conservative politicians; and, very evidently, they had fairly overcome their plebeian, revolutionary rivals, in an appeal to the body of the inhabitants. With a complete knowledge of the small number of those who had previously assumed to represent the masses of the unfranchised inhabitants, and with as complete a knowledge of the general harmlessness of those masses, in the absence of their self-constituted leaders, the high-toned promoters of the unpublished scheme of abridging the political power of the great body of the people had disarmed the former of their animosity, by rendering them harmless, as the helpless minority of the Committee of Fifty-one[1]—an empty honor with which, however, for the time being, they were evidently satisfied—while the latter were made contented, for a short time, also, by receiving a recognition of their political pretensions, in the privilege which was extended to them of confirming or rejecting the nominations made by the Caucus, among whom, with two or three exceptions, the names of their self-constituted leaders were conspicuously presented.[2]

"Liberty," "convoke the inhabitants of their City" to the Caucus at Sam. Francis's, although it was called by their aristocratic and conservative rivals in the party of the Opposition, and without any consultation with that Committee, if there was one, or with those who were in harmony with it. He said, also, "the Motion prevailed to supersede the "old Committee of Correspondence by a new one of fifty;" although neither of the three Resolutions of the Caucus contained the slightest allusion to any such supersedure, nor to any other Committee or body or person whatever than to the proposed Committee of fifty, which it nominated. He said of the Meeting at the Coffee-house, "and the nomination of the Committee was accepted, even with the addition of Isaac "Low as its Chairman, who was more of a loyalist than a patriot;" although, in fact, Isaac Low's name was on the list which had been nominated at the Caucus, against which no opposition was made; and the only "addition" which was made by the Meeting was that of Francis Lewis, whose name had been included on the original list of the minority, and rejected by the Caucus. The Meeting at the Coffee-house made no attempt to supply the Committee of Fifty-one with a Chairman, in the person of Isaac Low, as Bancroft has stated: Isaac Low was called to that place by the Committee itself, at its first Meeting, on Monday, May 23, as its *Minutes* abundantly prove. Doctor Sparks, (*Life of Gouverneur Morris*, i., 22,) merged the doings of the Caucus and the Meeting at the Coffee-house, into one mass; made Isaac Sears the master spirit of all that was done; and said "the Committee consisted of "a nearly equal number of both parties, but with a preponderance on "the liberal side;" although the truth was, the friends the Home Government took no part whatever, in either of those meetings; that both were composed of only those who opposed the Home Government; that the struggle, in each of the two assemblages, was between conflicting factions of the latter party; that, in both, the faction of the aristocratic conservative element of the party outvoted and defeated the faction representing, or pretending to represent, the unfranchised masses; that the Committee contained a large proportion of those who belonged, at that time, to the aristocratic conservative faction of the party; and that it is not known, nor is it supposed, that a single person was named on the Committee, who was not, at that time, opposed to the Colonial policy of the Home Government. Indeed, as Judge Jones, whose opportunities for ascertaining the exact truth and whose integrity and fearlessness in uttering it no one will seriously question, has emphatically stated, "all parties, denominations, and religions, apprehended, at that time, "that the Colonies laboured under grievances which wanted redressing;" and no one, therefore, opposed any reasonable movement which tended, or appeared to tend, to a peaceful redress of those serious grievances.

It will be seen, from this comparison of the original authorities with the use which has been made of them by the several leading writers of history in our country, just how little or how much reliance can be placed on what is called "*history*," in what relates to less important subjects, while this, which was second to few others, in the history of the Revolution, has been treated with so little of respect and of fidelity to the truth.

[1] *Lieutenant-governor Colden to Governor Tryon*, "SPRING-HILL 31st "May, 1774;" *the same to the Earl of Dartmouth*, "NEW YORK June 1st "1774;" Jones's *History of New York during the Revolutionary War*, i., 34; Leake's *Memoir of General John Lamb*, 87; Dawson's *History of the Park and its Vicinity*, 33; Bancroft's *United States*, original edition, viii., 41, 42; *the same*, centenary edition, iv., 327; etc.

Of the fifty-one members of the Committee, a very great majority were of the aristocratic, conservative, anti revolutionary portions of the inhabitants. On the fourth of July, when a test question was before it, thirty-eight members being present, only thirteen votes were cast by those who assumed to represent the unfranchised inhabitants; and in the greater contest, three days afterwards, on Mr. Thurber's Resolution, disavowing the proceedings of the great popular "Meeting in the Fields," over which Alexander McDougal had presided, only nine votes were cast in opposition to the vote of disavowal.

It may also be stated, in this place, that, notwithstanding none of the fifty-one, at that time, were of the Governmental party, but, on the contrary, that every one was earnestly opposed to the Colonial policy of the Home Government, twenty-one of the number, at a subsequent period, became acknowledged Loyalists; that a considerable number took no active part in the proceedings of the Committee, but could have been relied on, by the aristocratic, conservative leaders, had their presence and their votes been, at any time, needed; and that a greater number than there were of the last-named class—a working majority of the Committee, indeed—included such as John Alsop, Gabriel H. Ludlow, John Jay, and James Duane, who invariably acted and voted with the aristocratic, anti-revolutionary portion of the Committee, and, until they became candidates for the Congress, always in opposition to the revolutionary leaders and the revolutionary purposes.

Well might the exiled Judge, Thomas Jones, writing of this Committee, in the light of subsequent events, say, within ten years of its creation, notwithstanding what he had said of the opposition to the Colonial policy of the Home Government, which all of them had presented, "The "majority were real friends to Government." —(*History of New York during the Revolutionary War*, i., 34.)

[2] For the purpose of providing an additional authority, concerning much that has been stated, in this work, concerning the relations which existed between the confederated "Merchants and Traders" and other high-toned citizens, and the more numerous, but unfranchised, "Inhabi-"tants of the City and County;" concerning the desire of the former to abridge the influence which had been secured by the latter, while they were subject to the frequent appeals of the former; and concerning the formation of the "Committee of Correspondence," since known as the "Committee of Fifty one," for the purpose of recovering, to the confederated, conservative "Merchants and Traders" and the Gentry, the control of the political affairs of the City, we invite attention to the following very important Letter, written by a Westchester-county gentleman, who, when he could no longer serve the party of the Home Government,

The Committee which was thus created by the aristocratic, anti-revolutionary portion of those who, at that time, were opposing the Colonial policy of the Home Government, was largely intended, as we have shown, to serve as a check on the rising power, in political affairs, of the unfranchised Mechanics and Workingmen of the City of New York, especially of the revolutionary faction of those Working-men, while it would tend, also, to concentrate in "the Merchants "and Traders" and Gentry of the City, thus confederated for the exercise of it, all of that political power, especially in matters of national concern, which that City and Province, at that time, could command, without the existence of a thought, among those who had promoted the scheme, if such a thought had any-

was among the earliest to become its nominal opponent; and, subsequently, to pose as a distinguished "patriot" and as a not less distinguished *republican* statesman:

"NEW YORK, May 20, 1774.

"DEAR SIR:

"You have heard, and you will hear, a great deal about politics; "and in the heap of Chaff *you* may find some grains of good sense. Be-"lieve me, Sir, Freedom and Religion are only watchwords. We have "appointed a Committee, or, rather, we have nominated one. Let me "give you the history of it.

"It is needless to premise, that the lower orders of Mankind are more "easily led by specious appearances than those of a more exalted station. "This, and many similar propositions, you know better than your hum-"ble servant.

"The troubles in *America*, during *Grenville's* Administration, put our "Gentry upon this *finesse*. They stimulated some daring Coxcombs to "rouse the Mob into an attack upon the bounds of order and decency. "These fellows became the *Jack Cades* of the day, the Leaders in all the "Riots, the Bellwethers of the Flock. The reason of the manœuvre, in "those who wished to keep fair with the Government and, at the same "time, to receive the incense of popular applause, you will readily per-"ceive. On the whole, the Shepards were not much to blame, in a po-"litical point of view. The Bellwethers jingled merrily, and roared "out, 'Liberty,' and 'Property,' and 'Religion,' and a multitude of "cant terms, which every one thought he understood, and was egregi-"ously mistaken; for you must know the Shepherds kept the Dictionary "of the Day; and, like the Mysteries of the ancient Mythology, it was "not for profane eyes and ears. This answered many purposes: the "simple Flock put themselves entirely under the protection of these "most excellent Shepherds.

"By-and-bye, behold a great metamorphosis, without the help of Ovid "or his Divinities; but entirely effectuated by two modern Genii, the "God of Ambition and the Goddess of Faction. The first of these "prompted the Shepherds to shear some of their Flock; and, then, in "conjunction with the other, converted the Bellwethers into Shepherds. "That we have been in hot water with the British Parliament, ever "since, every body knows: consequently these new Shepherds have had "their hands full of employment. The old ones kept themselves least in "sight; and a want of confidence in each other was not the least evil "which followed. The Port of *Boston* has been shut up. These Sheep, "simple as they are, cannot be gulled, as heretofore. In short, there is "no ruling them; and, now, to leave the metaphor, the heads of the "Mobility grow dangerous to the Gentry; and how to keep them down "is the question.

"While they correspond with the other Colonies, call and dismiss "popular Assemblies, make Resolves to bind the Consciences of the rest "of Mankind, bully poor Printers, and exert with full force all their "other tribunitial powers, it is impossible to curb them. But Art some-"times goes farther than Force: and, therefore, to trick them hand-"somely, a Committee of Patricians was to be nominated; and into their "hands was to be committed the Majesty of the People; and the highest "trust was to be reposed in them by a mandate that they should take "care, *quod respublica non capiat injuriam*. The Tribunes, through the "want of good legerdemain in the senatorial order, perceived the finesse; "and, yesterday, I was present at a grand division of the City; and, "there, I beheld my fellow-citizens very accurately counting all their

a people, at such a time, and under such circumstances as then existed, and which would probably continue to exist, might, also, sensibly or insensibly, weaken if where existed, that such an organization, among such it should not destroy all those bonds of recognized dependence, and loyalty, and love, which, hitherto, had so firmly bound the Colony to the Mother Country. But, notwithstanding the evident intentions of those among whom the thought of creating such a Committee had originated; notwithstanding the purposes for which it had been created included no such purpose; and notwithstanding a separation of the Colonies from the Mother Country had not yet become one of the questions of the day, that Committee of Correspondence in the City of New York, created and

"Chickens, not only before any of them were hatched, but before above "one half of the Eggs were laid. In short, they fairly contended about "the future forms of our Government, whether it should be founded "upon aristocratic or democratic principles.

"I stood in the Balcony; and, on my right hand were ranged all the "people of property, with some few poor dependants: and, on the other, "all the Tradesmen, etc., who thought it worth their while to leave "their daily labour for the good of the Country. The spirit of the "English Constitution has yet a little influence left, and but a little. "The remains of it, however, will give the wealthy people a superiority, "this time; but, would they secure it, they must banish all Schoolmas-"ters and confine all Knowledge to themselves. This cannot be. The "Mob begin to think and to reason. Poor Reptiles! it is, with them, a "vernal Morning; they are struggling to cast off their Winter's Slough; "they bask in the Sunshine; and, ere Noon, they will bite, depend "upon it. The Gentry begin to fear this. Their Committee will be "appointed; they will deceive the People; and, again, they will forfeit "a share of their Confidence. And if these instances of what with one "side is Policy, with the other Perfidy, shall continue to increase, and "become more frequent, farewell, Aristocracy. I see, and I see it with "fear and trembling, that if the Disputes with *Great Britain* continue, "we shall be under the worst of all possible dominions; we shall be "under the domination of a riotous Mob.

"It is the interest of all men, therefore, to seek for re-union with the "parent State. A safe Compact seems, in my poor opinion, to be now "tendered. Internal taxation to be left with ourselves. The right of "regulating Trade to be vested in Britain, where alone is found the "power of protecting it. I trust you will agree with me, that this is "the only possible mode of union. * * * *

"I am, Sir,, etc,,

"MR. PENN. "GOUVERNEUR MORRIS."

It was never pretended, if our memory serves us correctly, that the writer of this letter was a *democratic* republican: our readers can easily determine, from his contemptuous words, while describing the unfranchised Mechanics and Working-men of this City, how little of a republican of any other class, how much of a believer of the political dogma of the unqualified equality of all men, he was, notwithstanding what some historians, so called, have written of him.

In the same spirit, was that note written by James Rivington, of New York, and received by Henry Knox, of Boston, subsequently a General in the Army of the Revolution and Secretary of War under President Washington, and (in his own estimation) never one of the people, which note was detected by the revolutionary leaders in Boston, and communicated to the "Sons of Liberty," in New York, by note, dated 19 June, 1774. The words used by Rivington were these: "You may rest as-"sured that no non-im-, nor non-ex-portation will be agreed upon "either here or at Philadelphia. The power over our crowd is no "longer in the hands of Sears, Lamb, and such unimportant persons, "who have for six years past, been the demagogues of a very turbulent "faction in this City; but their power and mischievous capacity ex-"pired instantly upon the election of the Committee of Fifty-one, in "which there is a majority of inflexibly honest, loyal, and prudent "citizens."—(*MS letter of Thomas Young to John Lamb*, "BOSTON, 19th "June, 1774," In the "*Lamb Papers*," New York Historical Society's Library.)

fostered by the most aristocratic of her citizens, from the beginning of its existence, was one of the most powerful of those instrumentalities which, at that very time, were sapping the foundations of the Throne, in the Colonies; and it was through the proposition and the persistent effort of that particular Committee, that, very soon after it was organized, another and yet more influential body was created, composed of influential and able men, mainly from the higher classes of society, by whom, not long afterwards, the Home Government was arraigned before the bar of the entire world, on well-sustained charges of Usurpation and Oppression; by whom, also, the standard of a united Rebellion of all the Colonies was raised; and by whom a revolutionary power, united and energetic, extending throughout the entire seaboard, was raised for its support. In opposition to the purposes and the demands of the small revolutionary element, in New York—in opposition, also, to the leaders and the revolutionary populace, in Boston, with whom the revolutionary leaders in New York were in constant correspondence and in entire harmony—the Committee which the conservative, anti-revolutionary aristocracy of New York had thus created for the protection and the promotion of its own particular interests, the domestic as well as the foreign, originally proposed and persistently insisted on the organization of a Congress of Delegates from *all* the Colonies, for the united consideration of *all* the matters in difference between *all* the Colonies and the Home Government; and it was that Congress, thus called into existence by an anti-revolutionary body, by assuming authority which had not been delegated to it and by disregarding the expressed opinions and intentions of those who were represented therein—at the expense, also, of its own consistency, in excepting one of the Colonies from the provisions of its *Association*, in order to secure the vote of that Colony for the enforcement of that *Association* upon all the other Colonies—which not only closed the door of reconciliation with the Mother Country, which it was expected to have opened to its widest extent; but, practically, it organized a systematic and general Revolution, throughout the entire seaboard, which, ultimately, led to the overthrow of all monarchial power, within the entire territory of each and every one of its several constituent Colonies. Such a notable instance of the thing which had been created for a specific purpose, having been turned, in the progress of events, by the tact of a small proportion of its members, without violence and by some of those who had favored and assisted in the construction of it, against the greater number of those who had created it and for the overthrow of their purposes in having done so, as was seen in the instance of that Committee of Correspondence in New York and in its notable results, is worthy of notice and remembrance; and it may well serve, also, as a perpetual reminder, to those whose political conduct has not been altogether honest, and whose inclinations have, sometimes, been directed toward something else than that which has been indicated by their professions, that

> "There's a Divinity that shapes our ends,
> "Rough hew them how we will."

While the consolidated Opposition, in the City of New York, was thus actively employed in making preparations for a vigorous opposition to the latest measures of the Home Government and, in order to make that opposition more effective, in transferring the leadership of the confederated party of the Opposition from the few who had previously assumed to lead the revolutionary portion of the unfranchised masses, in the violent proceedings in which, from time to time, the latter had been engaged, to the greater number, of higher social and pecuniary and political standing, who formed the large majority of the Committee of Correspondence which it was creating, as its leader, in its opposition to the Ministry, the Town of Boston, also, was anxiously and carefully preparing for the coming catastrophe.

On the evening of Tuesday, the tenth of May,[1] Captain Shayler arrived in the latter place, bringing intelligence of the passage of the Act of Parliament closing that Port. On the following day, Wednesday, the eleventh of May, the Committees of Correspondence from eight of the adjacent Towns were invited to meet the Boston Committee, for consultation;[2] and on Thursday, the twelfth of May, those Committees assembled at Faneuil Hall, with Samuel Adams in the Chair and Joseph Warren acting as the leader, on the floor, and determined to send "Circular Letters" to the several Committees of Correspondence, where such Committees existed, in the other Colonies, urging, as the only proposed remedy for the threatened grievances, a renewal of that Non-Importation *Association* which, during the excitement which had followed the passage of the Stamp-Act, had been productive of so much success.[3] On Friday, the thirteenth of May, a Meeting of the Freeholders and other inhabitants of the Town, legally qualified and duly warned, was holden in Faneuil Hall, Samuel Adams being in the Chair, at which it was voted, "that it is the opinion of this Town, that, if the other "Colonies come into a joint Resolution to stop all "Importation from Great Britain and Exportation to "Great Britain and every part of the West Indies, till

[1] The *Massachusetts Gazette* of Thursday, May 12, 1774, printed the text of the Boston Port-bill, in full, with the following heading: "Tuesday arrived here Captain Shayler, in a Brig from London, who brought "the most interesting and important Advices that ever was received at "the Port of Boston."

See, also, Bancroft's *History of the United States*, original edition, vii., 34; *the same*, centenary edition, iv., 321; Frothingham's *Rise of the Republic*, 320; etc.

[2] Bancroft's *History of the United States*, original edition, vii., 35; *the same*, centenary edition, iv., 321; Frothingham's *Rise of the Republic*, 321.

[3] Bancroft's *History of the United States*, original edition, vii., 35-37; *the same*, centenary edition, iv., 321-323; Frothingham's *Rise of the Republic*, 321, etc.

"the Act for blocking up this Harbour be repealed, "the same will prove the Salvation of North America "and her Liberties. On the other hand, if they con- "tinue their Exports and Imports, there is high reason "to fear that Fraud, Power, and the most odious Op- "pression will rise, triumphant, over Right, Justice, "Social Happiness, and Freedom." It was also "*Ordered*, that this Vote be forthwith transmitted by "the Moderator to all our sister Colonies, in the "Name and Behalf of the Town."[1]

It will be seen, in these faithful statements of the doings of the leaders of the revolutionary party and of the doings of the revolutionary party, itself, in Boston, in May, 1774, that Massachusetts-men, there and at that time, recognized the existence of no grievance whatever, in any of the Colonies, except that which had been inflicted on Boston, in the passage of the Boston Port-Bill; that they elevated that local grievance, which had been inflicted only as a penalty for local offences against existing Statutes, to the level of that general Stamp-Act, which had been inflicted on every Colonist, throughout the entire Continent, not as a penalty for wrong doing, but as a general Tax, levied only for the increase of the national Revenue; that they considered that a general determination, by all the Colonies, from Nova Scotia to Florida, to hold no commercial intercourse whatever with the Mother Country and with all the West Indian Colonies, foreign as well as British, was necessary for the protection of the delinquent Town from the threatened consequences of its persistent violation of the Laws of the Nation; that they arrogantly assumed that general action of all the Colonies must be taken, uniformly, in a distinct and clearly defined line, which those Massachusetts-men specifically and definitely laid down, and in no other line whatever, leaving nothing to the choice or the better judgment or the existing circumstances of any others, any where; that even their New England ingenuity contrived no other remedy for their merely local grievance than that specific suspension of the entire agricultural and manufacturing industries of all the Colonies, except to the extent of supplying the demand for the productions of their industries for home-consumption only, as well as the specific suspension of all the Commerce of all the Colonies, except that with the French Colonies of St. Pierre and Miquelon, on the coast of Newfoundland—with which, by the bye, so large a portion of the smuggling by Massachusetts-men was, then and subsequently, carried on[2]—all of which, without any possible abatement, they definitely proposed and positively insisted on; and that, in their complacency, they dared, also, to assert, if not to threaten, that the consequence of disobedience to their audacious proposition, in any of the Colonies, would be the triumphant rise of Fraud, Power, and the most odious Oppression, over Right, Justice, Social Happiness, and Freedom.[3] In short, the principles and "patriotic" impulses of those men of Boston began and ended in the proposed promotion of nothing else than their own individual and local interests, at the expense of the entire prostration of business, internal as well as external, except that of Smuggling, from one extremity to the other of the Atlantic seaboard—the warp, the woof, and the filling of their neatly woven web were, in fact, nothing else, whatever, than unadulterated, audacious selfishness; and that selfishness, in that particular connection, was seen, more distinctly than it had previously been seen, when, a few weeks afterwards, the alms of the Continent, which had been sent for the particular relief of the sick and suffering poor of Boston, whom, it was said, the Port-Bill had

---

[1] *Proceedings of the Meeting*, in Force's *American Archives*, Fourth Series, i., 331, and in Dawson's *The Park and its Vicinity*, 32.

See, also, *Letter from Thomas Young to John Lamb*, "BOSTON, May 13, "1774;" Holt's *New-York Journal*, No. 1657, NEW-YORK, Thursday, May 19, 1774; *Rivington's New-York Gazetteer*, No. 57, NEW-YORK, Thursday, May 19, 1774; Gaine's *New-York Gazette and Mercury*, No. 1178, NEW-YORK, Monday, May 23, 1774; *Lieutenant-governor Colden to Governor Tryon*, "SPRING HILL 31st May, 1774;" *the same to the Earl of Dartmouth*, "NEW-YORK 1st June, 1774;" *Annual Register for* 1775, 4; *History of the War in America*, Dublin: 1779, i., 19, 20; Andrews' *History of the War with America*, London: 1785, i., 131; Gordon's *History of the American Revolution*, London: 1788, i., 304; Ramsey's *History of the American Revolution*, London: 1791, i., 132; Stedman's *History of the American War*, London: 1794, i., 93; Adolphus's *History of England*, London: 1805, ii., 122, 123; "Paul Allen's" *History of the American Revolution*, Baltimore, 1822, i., 181; Morse's *Annals of the American Revolution*, Hartford: 1824, 179, 180; Pitkin's *History of the United States*, New Haven: 1828, i., 270; Grahame's *History of the United States*, London: 1836, iv., 317, 318; Hildreth's *History of the United States*, New York: 1856, First Series, iii., 34; Leake's *Memoir of General John Lamb*, Albany: 1857, 84-86; Lossing's *Seventeen hundred and seventy-six*, New York: 122; Lossing's *Field-book of the Revolution*, New York: 1851, i., 507; Bancroft's *History of the United States*, original edition, Boston: 1858, vii., 37; *the same*, centenary edition, Boston: 1876, iv., 323; Frothingham's *Rise of the Republic*, Boston: 1872, 321, 322; Lodge's *History of the English Colonies*, New York: 1881, 489; etc.

Lenerum, (*History of the United States*;) Lossing, (*History of the United States*, 1854;) and Ridpath, (*History of the United States*;) made no allusion to this very important Meeting.

[2] "LORD SANDWICH.—Do not the New England Fishing-ships carry on "an illicit Trade with the French?

"COMMODORE SHUTDHAM.—Certainly: their Ships meet at Sea; and "they supply them with Provisions, Rum, Stores, and the Ships them- "selves; and return loaded with French Manufactures."—(*Examination of Commodore Shuldham, Governor of Newfoundland, before the House of Lords*, March 15, 1775.)

[3] It will not be out of place, in this connection, to state the fact that Boston could have averted all the evils ascribed to the Boston Port-Bill, by paying for what some of her lawless inhabitants had destroyed—as property destroyed by mobs, in our day, must be paid for by the County in which it is destroyed, as Allegheny-county, Pennsylvania, sorrowfully knows, as one of the several results of the notable "Pittsburg Riots" of 1877. She was evidently inclined to do so, in the beginning; but she was counselled by the Caucus of Town Committees, prompted by Joseph Warren, not to do so; and the Committee of Correspondence at Philadelphia subsequently urged her to pay, without success. As will be seen, in another part of this Chapter, however, the infliction of the Boston Port-Bill was a pecuniary advantage to that Town; and it is not impossible that it was foreseen, at that time, that a payment for the Tea which had been destroyed by one of her mobs, would deprive the Town of all the pecuniary advantages to be derived from a refusal to do so.

What wonderful results, arising from that refusal to pay for what a mob had destroyed, have been seen, throughout the world, from that day to this.

deprived of their usual means of support, were diverted from the particular purposes for which they had been contributed, and employed, instead, for the particular benefit of Boston's tax-payers, in relieving them from the neces-sity of levying an unusual Poor-tax for the relief of the more than usually large number of those who were willing to live on charity; and in "cleaning Docks, making Dykes, new laying "of old Pavements in the public streets, etc."—all of them "public concerns, of no advantage to any in-"dividual, any further than as a member of the "community to which he or she belonged. Not a "single Wharf, Dock, Dyke, or Pavement, belonging "to any individual, was ordered to be made or "repaired," notwithstanding many of those who had been really thrown out of employment could have found renumerative occupation in such works of private concern; "but only such" were thus made or repaired "as, by the constant usage of the Town, had "always been supported at the expense of the pub-"lic"—in other words, at the expense of the tax-payers, the aristocracy of that peculiarly democratic and peculiarly revolutionary Town. One of "the "chief concerns of the principal inhabitants" was "for those Tradesmen, whose small funds, though "sufficient for the small purposes of life, yet would "soon be exhausted, if their resources were cut off"—in other words, for the payment of debts, due by those Tradesmen to those "principal Inhabitants," which, otherwise, would have been worthless—and Nails, and Ropes, and Baizes, and "Shirt-cloths," and Shoes, and other articles were manufactured, at the expense of the charitable, elsewhere, which were disposed of, by the "Gentlemen" who managed the speculation, to whom and at such prices as best answered the purposes of all concerned.[1] Need there be any surprise that, as one of their countrymen has since said, without a blush, "the people of Boston, "then the most flourishing commercial Town on the "Continent, never regretted their being the principal "object of ministerial vengeance;" telling us, at the same time, that the "thousands who depended on their "daily labor for bread said: 'We shall suffer in a "'good cause; the righteous Being who takes care of "'the Ravens that cry unto him, will provide for us "'and ours'"?[2] Need there be any surprise, also, that such principles and such purposes as were thus presented to the several Colonies, found little favor, anywhere, except among those of the assumed leaders of the unfranchised inhabitants of the City of New York, who favored revolutionary measures, and who had not been included in the recently appointed Committee of Correspondence, the Committee of Fifty-one, in that City?[3]

On Tuesday evening, the seventeenth of May, Paul Revere, bearing letters from the Committee of Correspondence, in Boston, in which were inclosed copies of the Vote of that Town, to which reference has been made, arrived in the City of New York[4]—there was, also, in his saddlebags, a very interesting letter from one of the master spirits in that Town, to his correspondent in New York, reciting more of the motives of the Massachusetts-men, in their construction of the Resolutions of the Town-meeting in Boston, than was told elsewhere;[5] but there is no evidence that Revere brought anything whatever from the Caucus which had been convened in Faneuil Hall, on the preceding Wednesday.[6] In accordance with his instructions, Revere immediately proceeded to Philadelphia, to deliver the letters which had been addressed to the Committee of Correspondence in that City;[7] and

[1] A paper, dated "Boston August 29, 1774," responsive to "a report "industriously propagated in New York"—but without any indication by whom written or where published—which was printed in Force's *American Archives*, Fourth Series, i., 743, 744.

See, also, a *Letter from William Cooper*—the well-known Town-Clerk of Boston—*to a Gentleman in New York*, dated "Boston: *September* 12, "1774," written in response to inquiries, and with the knowledge of "some of the Committee appointed to receive donations."

[2] Bancroft's *History of the United States*, original edition, vii., 48; *the same*, centenary edition, iv., 332.

On the thirty-first of May, 1774, John Scollay wrote, from Boston, to Arthur Lee, in London, "Thousands that depend on their daily labour "for support, must be reduced to the greatest degree of distress and "want. However, they will suffer in a good Cause, and that righteous "Being who takes care of the Ravens who cry unto Him, will provide "for them and theirs."

How wonderfully similar thoughts, originated in different minds, will sometimes run in parallel grooves, far apart, as in this instance; and still more wonderful it is, when, as in this instance, the thoughts are uttered in words so wonderfully similar.

[3] Alexander McDougal and all those of the former revolutionary leaders who were included in that Committee, as will be seen in the course of this narrative, on the twenty-third of May, by a formal vote, concurred with their aristocratic, anti-revolutionary associates in condemning the proposition of the Town of Boston and in offering another, in its stead: it remained only for John Lamb and those who had not been favored with seats in that body, to continue their agreement, in political affairs, with the revolutionary leaders, in Boston.

It will be seen, also, in the course of this narrative, that Boston was not sustained, in her unreasonable demands, by any of the Committees of the larger Towns and Cities, in other Colonies.

[4] "On Tuesday Evening, arrived here Mr. Revere, who came Express "from Boston, which he left on Saturday, about 2 o'clock in the After-"noon."—(Holt's *New-York Journal*, No. 1637, New-York, Thursday, May 19, 1774.)

[5] Reference is made to a letter which was written by Thomas Young, immediately after the adjournment of the Town-Meeting, May 13, and addressed to John Lamb, in the City of New York. It may be seen among the "*Lamb Papers*," in the Library of the New York Historical Society; and every student of the history of that eventful period will be amply re-paid for whatever time he may spend in a careful perusal of it.

[6] The *Minutes of the Committee of Correspondence*, "New York, *Monday*, "*May* 23, 1774," contain a record of the reading of "Letters from the "Committee of Correspondence of Boston, with a Vote of the Town of "Boston, of the 13th instant, and a Letter from the Committee of Phil-"adelphia;" and, in the absence of any allusion to any other letter whatever, there is no reason for supposing that anything, in addition to these three letters, was received from any other organization or person, at Boston or elsewhere.

[7] Revere was at Philadelphia, on the twentieth of May, when the inhabitants of that City appointed its Committee of Correspondence; and, on the following day, he left that City, on his return, carrying with him, to New York and Boston, if not to other Towns and Cities on his route, copies of a Circular Letter, probably from the pen of John Dickinson, containing the response of Philadelphia to the Boston Resolutions, and, generally, surveying the political situation of the Colonies, from the Philadelphia standpoint.—(*Proceedings of the Meeting which appointed the Committee, May 20, 1774, and a copy of the Circular Letter, written by the*

those who had been nominated to the Committee of Correspondence in New York, the Committee itself not having been formally established, evidently availed themselves of that opportunity to write to Philadelphia, in which, also, no Committee had been appointed, on the subject of the Boston Resolutions, and, unquestionably, in opposition to the propositions which they contained.[1]

Those who had been appointed to membership in the proposed Committee of Correspondence of the City of New York—in the "Committee of Fifty-"one," as it was popularly called—were duly assembled, at the Coffee-House, on Monday, the twenty-third of May, 1774, forty-three of the fifty-one being present; and the Committee was duly organized by the appointment of Isaac Low, as its permanent Chairman, and that of John Alsop, as its permanent Deputy-chairman[2]—at a subsequent Meeting, Joseph Allicocke was appointed Secretary, and Thomas Pettit, Messenger, of the Committee;[3] the first two, in whom some authority was vested, being high-toned, anti-revolutionary Merchants; while the last two, who were not members of the Committee, and to whom no authority was given, were among those unfranchised, revolutionary Workingmen, whom the former had previously looked on with so much disfavor.

Immediately after the organization of the Committee had been completed, a letter was received from "the body of the Mechanics, signed by Jonathan "Blake, their Chairman," informing the Committee of the concurrence of the Mechanics with the other inhabitants of the City, in their nomination of it; which clearly indicated the entire good faith of the great body of the unfranchised masses, in the transfer of the leadership of the confederated party of the Opposition, from those, with revolutionary tendencies, who had called themselves "Sons of Liberty," to the aristocratic, conservative elements of the party opposed to the Colonial policy of the Home Government, which had been made at the Coffee-house, on the preceding Thursday; and clearly indicating, also, that whatever the differences between the two factions, on social questions, might be, they were one in all which related to the great political questions of the day, concerning the obnoxious features of the Colonial policy of the Home Government, notwithstanding the disappointment of some of the assumed leaders of those masses, when they had failed to secure seats in the Committee[4]—the sinister purposes of those who had proposed the Caucus which had been assembled at Sam. Francis's had been established; the unfranchised masses and those who had assumed to be their leaders had been generally hoodwinked; and even the watchful "Sons of Liberty," with here and there an exception, were apparently contented.

At the same meeting of the Committee, the letters from the Committees of Correspondence in Boston and Philadelphia, to which reference has been made, were laid before it. The letter from Philadelphia being only a reflex of what had been written to that Committee by those who had subsequently been confirmed as members of this, it received no official attention, at that time; but those from Boston, which included the Vote of the Town of which mention has been made, were referred to a Sub-committee, composed of Alexander McDougal, Isaac Low, James Duane, and John Jay, with instructions to consider the subject to which those letters were devoted; to prepare a draft of an answer thereto; and to report the same, to the Committee, at eight o'clock on the same evening, to which hour the Committee then adjourned.[5]

The disposition of the majority of the Committee of Correspondence, as well as the line of action which those who controlled it[6] intended to take, as far as it related to the great body of the unfranchised inhabitants and their rapidly increasing influence in the control of the political affairs of the Colony, was clearly defined and boldly presented, at that first opportunity to do so, in the formation of that very important Sub-Committee, in which the well-known

---

Committee—both reprinted in Force's *American Archives*, Fourth Series, i., 310-312.)

[1] *The Committee of Correspondence of Philadelphia to the Committee of Correspondence to Boston*, "PHILADELPHIA, *May* 21st, 1774," copies of which "were transmitted to New-York and most of the Southern Colo-"nies."

[2] *Minutes of the Committee*, "NEW-YORK, *Monday, May* 23d, 1774."

[3] *Minutes of the Committee*, "NEW-YORK, *May* 30, 1774."

[4] *Minutes of the Committee*, "NEW-YORK, *Monday, May* 23d, 1774."

See, also Holt's *New-York Journal*, No. 1638, NEW-YORK, Thursday, May 26, 1774, in which appears the following: "Since the Meeting at the Coffee-House on Thursday last, the Merchants and Mechanicks, who were "opposed to the Committee of Correspondence consisting of Fifty-one "Persons, have, for the Salutary Purpose of Union among ourselves, "agreed to that Number; and that the Gentlemen whose Names were "published in Mr. Gaine's last Paper, be the Committee for this City."

The correspondence of Lieutenant-governor Colden with Governor Tryon and with the Earl of Dartmouth very clearly indicates that that remarkable old man was not deceived by the doings, in politics, of the "Merchants and Traders" and Gentry of New York; that their social and commercial and professional standing did not warrant what he regarded, very reasonably, their tendency toward rebellion; and that, while he hoped their influence would restrain the violence of those with whom they were associated, he never regarded them as, truly, friends of the Home Government nor of the Sovereign.

[5] *Minutes of the Committee*, "NEW-YORK, *Monday, May* 23, 1774."

[6] Bancroft, (*History of the United States*, original edition, vii., 41, 42; *the same*, centenary edition, iv., 327,) said "the control fell into the "hands of men who, like John Jay, still aimed at reconciling a contin-"ued dependence on England with the just freedom of the Colonies."

The principal purposes of the Committee, in all which related to national politics, were the protection of those who were constantly employed in Smuggling; the exemption of the Colonies from the payment of Import Duties and Direct Taxes levied by the Parliament; and the continued military protection of the Colonies, at the expense of the Mother Country, unless the unlikely contingency should arise of a voluntary taxation of themselves, for that purpose. Besides these, the chief purpose of the Committee was to relegate the unfranchised masses of the City of New York, of all classes, to the obscurity and dependence of vassals; and to place itself at the head of all the political elements of the Colony, as the autocratic, anti-revolutionary ruler of both the Colonists and the Government—in all of which, unquestionably, James Duane's and John Jay's were the master minds, within the Committee, and William Smith's that which was not within it.

ultra-democratic Chairman was made harmless, in the interest of the conservative aristocracy, by the addition of three of the most conservative members of the Committee, as his associates; and what was known to have been the decided preference of the revolutionary portion of the unfranchised Working-men of the City, by whom the policy and the action of the Town of Boston were known to have been generally approved, was openly, if not defiantly, disregarded.

At eight o'clock, in the evening, the Committee assembled in an adjourned Meeting, thirty-eight of the fifty-one members being present; and the Sub-committee, which had been appointed at the forenoon session, reported the following draft of a letter, as suitable for a response to the letters received from Boston:

"NEW-YORK, May 23, 1774.

"GENTLEMEN:

"The alarming Measures of the British Parliament, "relative to your ancient and respectable Town, "which has so long been the Seat of Freedom, fill the "Inhabitants of this City with inexpressible Alarm.

"As a sister Colony, suffering in Defence of the "Rights of America, we consider your Injuries as a "common Cause, to the redress of which it is equally "our Duty and our Interest to contribute. But, what "ought to be done in a Situation so truly critical, "while it employs the anxious Thoughts of every "generous Mind, is very hard to be determined.

"Our Citizens have thought it necessary to appoint "a large Committee, consisting of fifty-one Persons, "to correspond with our sister Colonies, on this and "every other matter of public Moment; and, at ten "o'clock this forenoon, we were first assembled. Your "Letter, enclosing the Vote of the Town of Boston, "and the Letter of your Committee of Correspond-"ence, were immediately taken into consideration."

"While we think you justly entitled to the Thanks "of your sister Colonies, for asking their Advice on "a Case of such extensive Consequences, we lament "our Inability to relieve your Auxiety, by a decisive "Opinion. The Cause is general, and concerns a "whole Continent, who are equally interested with "you and us; and we foresee that no Remedy can "be of avail, unless it proceeds from the joint Act "and Approbation of all. From a virtuous and "spirited Union, much may be expected; while the "feeble Efforts of a Few will only be attended with "Mischief and Disappointments to themselves, and "Triumph to the Adversaries of our Liberty.

"Upon these Reasons, we conclude that a Congress "of Deputies from the Colonies, in general, is of the "utmost Moment; that it ought to be assembled, "without Delay; and some unanimous Resolution "formed, in this fatal Emergency, not only respect-"ing your deplorable Circumstances, but for the "Security of our common Rights. Such being our "Sentiments, it must be premature to pronounce any "Judgment on the Expedient which you have sug-"gested. We beg, however, that you will do us the "Justice to believe that we shall continue to Act "with a firm and becoming Regard to American "Freedom, and to co-operate with our sister Colonies, "in every Measure which shall be thought salutary "and conducive to the public Good.

"We have nothing to add, but that we sincerely "condole with you, in your unexampled Distresses, "and to request your speedy Opinion of the proposed "Congress, that, if it shall meet with your Approba-"tion, we may exert our utmost Endeavours to carry "it into execution.

"We are, Gentlemen," etc.

That evidently well-considered paper, probably the production of the mind and the pen of James Duane,[1] was so temperate in its tone and so judicious in its suggestions, that, after it had been presented as the Report of the Sub-Committee, it commended itself to the Committee with so much force, that it was approved without a dissenting voice;[2] and the Chairman was ordered to send copies of it, duly signed, to the Committees of Correspondence, in Boston and Philadelphia.[3]

It will be seen that the Committee regarded the dispute with the Home Government as something more than a merely local matter, in which the Town of Boston was the only sufferer; and that it was not inclined, therefore, to confine its action, as the Vote of that Town had sought to confine it, to the particular subject of the Boston Port-Bill, nor to direct all its efforts, as that Vote had solicited, entirely to the redress of the grievances of that particular Town. On the contrary, it recognized the equal importance of "every other matter of public moment;" it asserted that "the Cause was general and concerned a "whole Continent, who was equally interested" with themselves; and it insisted that "no remedy can be "of avail, unless it proceeded from the joint Act and "Approbation of all." It was not inclined, without

[1] We are not insensible of the fact that many suppose that the authorship of this notable letter belongs to John Jay: but, because the entire spirit of it is so unlike what he would have presented in such a letter, written under such circumstances; and because he is known to have been more inclined to resort to a Non-Importation Agreement than James Duane was, we prefer to favor the belief that the latter gentleman wrote it.

[2] Because it was so entirely antagonistic to the known principles of the Boston-men with whom the minority of the Committee, in their individual relations, had been previously so entirely in accord, this answer to the letters from Boston, approved by the unanimous vote of the Committee, affords additional evidence of the entire good faith of the great body of the unfranchised inhabitants of the City, in its concurrence in the appointment of the Committee of Fifty-one, and of the acquiescence in that appointment of, at least, those of the previously assumed leaders of those inhabitants who had been admitted to seats in that Committee.

[3] *Minutes of the Committee*, (adjourned Meeting) "NEW YORK, *May* 23, "1774;" Holt's *New-York Journal*, No. 1638, NEW-YORK, Thursday, May 26, 1774; Gaine's *New-York Gazette and Mercury*, No. 1178, NEW-YORK, Monday, May 23; No. 1179, NEW-YORK, Monday, May 30, and No. 1183, NEW-YORK, Monday, June 27, 1774; *Rivington's New-York Gazetteer*, No. 57, NEW-YORK Thursday, May 19, and No. 58, NEW-YORK, Thursday, May 26, 1774.

due consideration, to paralyze the industries and the commerce of the entire Continent, only for the particular benefit of one Town—it preferred to regard the particular grievance of that Town as only one among many grievances, endured by other Towns, as well as by that, and by the entire Continent; and it wisely made all those grievances a common cause, and proposed to remedy them, as far as a remedy could be found in America, by a concerted movement of all the parties who were suffering from them. It was the first, or among the first, to disregard the peculiar selfishness of the popular leaders in Boston, by whom the grievances of that particular Town had been thrust into an undue prominence, for the relief of which, especially, they insisted, the entire efforts of the entire Continent must be directed;[1] and it was the first to propose and to insist on the convention of a Congress of Deputies from all the Colonies, in which all the grievances which were sustained by each and every of those Colonies could be duly considered, and concerted action be secured from the entire Continent, for the relief of all who were aggrieved.[2] How much, in that well-considered and judicious action, the Committee of Correspondence, in New York, offended those of the revolutionary clique, in that City, who had not been invited to places and seats in that Committee, and how much the revolutionary leaders and the revolutionary popu-

[1] The Committee of Correspondence of Philadelphia, after it had received and publicly read the opinions of those who had been nominated as members of the similar Committee, in New York, not yet organized, had, to some extent, done so, at an earlier date; but the reply of the Committee in New York accompanied that of the Committee in Philadelphia, Paul Revere having taken both, at the same time, on his return to Boston.

[2] We are not insensible of the fact that the origin of the Congress of the Continent, which was assembled at Philadelphia, in 1774, has been variously stated, by many of those who have preceded us; and we are equally sensible of the other fact, that individuals, in different Colonies, without any connection with each other, had suggested, *theoretically*, that such a Congress would be useful for various *limited* and, generally, *local* purposes, previously to that more general and practical proposition which was made by the Committee of Correspondence in New York, on the occasion under consideration.

The Town of Providence, in Town-meeting, May 17, 1774, was, probably, the first organized body which recommended a Congress of the several Colonies, for general purposes; but it only requested the Deputies of the Town, in the approaching General Assembly, to "use their influ-"ence," in that body, *not yet assembled*, "for promoting a Congress, as soon "as may be, of the Representatives of the General Assemblies of the "several Colonies and Provinces in North America," for the general purposes of the whole number. (*Proceedings of the Town-Meeting*, reprinted in Force's *American Archives*, Fourth Series, i., 333;) and the Committee of Correspondence of Philadelphia, in its reply to the Committee of Correspondence of Boston, dated "PHILADELPHIA, *May* 21, 1774," compared the proposition of Boston, to enter into an Association of Non-Exportation and Non-Intercourse, with the proposition of New-York, to convene a Congress of the Colonies, without determining which of the two it would approve, (*Letter, dated as above stated*,) leaving the subject undecided, until the eighteenth of June, when the Congress was determined on, by a Meeting of the Citizens, without the intervention of the Committee, (*Proceedings of the Meeting*, reprinted in Force's *American Archives*, Fourth Series, i., 426, 427.)

Because the General Assemblies of the greater number of the Colonies, at that time, could not have elected Deputies to the proposed Congress, even if they had been willing to have done so—the Governor having in each case, the power of proroguing or dissolving the Assembly, which, in the greater number of instances, he would have certainly done—the action of the Town of Providence, although well intended, could not result in the convention of a Congress; and what was done by the Committee of Correspondence in Philadelphia, was not entitled to the honorable mention of it, which Frothingham and others have made, since it amounted to nothing, either of approval or disapproval of the New-York proposition to convene a Congress. The honor, what there was of it, remains, therefore, with the Committee of Correspondence of New-York, as related in the text, of having originated the Congress, on the twenty-third of May, with the additional honor of having established the proposition for such a Congress, in the face of and notwithstanding the determined opposition of the Massachusetts-men, in Boston, led by Samuel Adams, Joseph Warren, and their well-eulogized associates.

The Committee of Correspondence of the Colony of Connecticut concurred in the recommendation which the Committee in New York had made, on the fourth of June, (*The Committee of Correspondence of the General Assembly of New York to the Committee of Correspondence of the Colony of Connecticut*, "NEW YORK, June 24, 1774;") the General Assembly of Rhode Island did so, on the fifteenth of June, (*Journal of the General Assembly*, June 15, 1774—*Records of Rhode Island*, vii., 246;) the General Court of Massachusetts did so on the seventeenth of June, (*Journal of the House of Representatives, June*, 1774;) and the City of Philadelphia, as above stated, did so on the eighteenth of June.

It has suited the purposes of some to bring forward the doings of eighty-nine members of the dissolved House of Burgesses of Virginia, assembled at the Raleigh Tavern, at Williamsburg, on the twenty-seventh of May, as a contestant for the honors of New York, in this matter; but that Meeting was held four days after the proposition had been made in New York; and what it did was only to "recommend to the Com-"mittee of Correspondence that they communicate with the several Cor-"responding Committees, on the expediency of appointing Deputies from "the several Colonies of British America, to meet in a General Con-"gress," etc., which was done on the following day, in which, however, nothing else was done than to solicit, from each Committee, its "senti-"ments on the subject." (*Proceedings of the Meeting*, reprinted in the *Boston Gazette* of June 13, 1774, quoted by Frothingham, in his *Rise of the Republic*, 333.)

The reliability of what is known as "history" may be seen in what has been published concerning this first proposition to convene a Congress of the Colonies. Frothingham, (*Rise of the Republic*, 322,) is the only one who has alluded to the really original, but impracticable, proposition by the Town of Providence. Without making the slightest allusion to what was done in New York, Burke's *Annual Register for* 1775, 6; *History of the War in America*, Dublin: 1779, i., 21; Andrews's *History of the War with America*, London: 1785, i., 135; Soulé's *Histoire des Troubles de l'Amérique Anglaise*, Paris: 1787, i., 48; Chez et Lebrun's *Histoire politique et philosophique de la Révolution*, Paris: an 9, 109; Stedman's *History of the American War*, London: 1794, i., 94, 95; Adolphus's *History of England*, London: 1805, ii., 124; "Paul Allen's" *History of the American Revolution*, Baltimore: 1822, i., 184; Pitkin's *History of the United States*, New Haven: 1828, i., 271, 272; Wilson's *History of the American Revolution*, Baltimore: 1824, 100; Grahame's *History of the United States*, London: 1836, iv., 240; Lossing's *Seventeen hundred and seventy-six*, New York: 1847, 124; his *Field-Book of the Revolution*, New York: 1851, ii., 486; Ridpath's *History of the United States*, New York: 1880, 296; A. H. Stephens's *History of the United States*, New York: 1874, 166, 167; Holmes's *History of the United States*, New York: 1871, 105, and several others, assigned the proposition for a Congress to Virginia. Mercy Warren's *History of the American Revolution*, Boston: 1805, i., 135; Lendrum's *History of the American Revolution*, Exeter: 1836, i., 63; De Rochelle's *États Unis d'Amérique*, Paris: 1845, 173; Lossing's *History of the United States*, New York: 1857, 227; and the series of small Histories of the United States, by the same author, without alluding to what was done in New York, preferred to regard what was done by the House of Representatives of Massachusetts, on the seventeenth of June, as the origin of the Congress. Frothingham's *Rise of the Republic*, 322, 323, ostentatiously presented what was done in Massachusetts and "the "other New England Colonies," and then said with questionable integrity, as he was acquainted with the facts, "the sentiment and determination "of the patriots south of New England were represented in the pro-"ceedings of the Virginia meeting," which he described, at considerable length, without making the slightest allusion to the earlier proceedings of Pennsylvania and New York, where the Congress certainly originated. Gordon's *History of the American Revolution*, London: 1788, i, 362, correctly assigned the origination of the Congress to the Committee of Cor-

lace of Boston were also offended by it, are well known to the student of the history of that period[1]—how much, also, that action of the Committee, in New York, has been made the text of misrepresentation and abuse, whenever it has been referred to, in the historical literature of New England, from that day to this, is known to all who are acquainted with the peculiar peculiarities of that well-filled class of the productions of American home-industry.[2]

The Committee of Correspondence, in New York, as it was known to the world, at that time, was created only as a local organization, for only special purposes, and with only a very limited and a very clearly defined authority.[3] But it very soon became evident that some, at least, of those who had promoted the organization of that Committee, only for limited and well-defined purposes, and who had subsequently assumed the entire control of its action, were well-inclined, for the advancement of their individual and family and factional influence and interests, to use every opportunity for the increase of the authority of the Committee, which was or which might be, in any way, afforded; and that they were not ill-disposed, in the prosecution of their peculiar purposes, to assume and to exercise authority which had not been vested in that or in any other organization, and limited only by their own ill-sustained views of expediency and propriety, cannot be successfully disputed.[4] Notably among those instances of authority unduly assumed by the Committee, was its early attempt to place itself at the head of all those, in every other County in the Colony, who were inclined to be or who were likely to become disaffected and revolutionary; which may be regarded as the second successful movement of the rapidly advancing revolutionary elements in the Colony of New York, among those who assumed to regard a revolution, conducted by themselves, as commendable and praiseworthy, while such a revolution, controlled by others, would be regarded and resisted, by them, as worthy only of condemnation and to be extirpated, the latter regardless of every other consequence.

For the purpose of extending its authority and of increasing its power, in whatever might arise, in its evident intent to control not only the great body of the unfranchised masses of every class, in the City of New York,[5] but the Colonial and the Home Goveru-

respondence in New York; but, without the slightest shadow of truth, it stated that the Committee was controlled by Isaac Sears, who was one of the minority of that body; and that it was opposed by "the To "ries," not one of which party was then a member of the Committee. Ramsay's *History of the United States*, London: 1791, i., 114, correctly assigned the origination of the Congress to New York; but it inaccurately stated that it was done "at the first meeting of the inhabitants," instead of at the first meeting of the Committee which the inhabitants had chosen, a few days previously, for their political leaders. Hildreth's *History of the United States*, New York: 1856, First Series, iii., 35, presented the facts as they really took place, giving to the Committee of Correspondence of New York the origination of the Congress; and Leake's *Memoir of General John Lamb*, Albany: 1857; Dawson's *Park and its Vicinity*, New York: 1855, 33; McDonald and Blackburn's *Southern History of the United States*, Baltimore: 1869, 170; and de Lancey's *Notes* on Jones's *History of New York during the Revolutionary War*, New York: 1879, i., 443, 444, follow that excellent example. Bancroft's *History of the United States*, original edition, vii., 40, correctly yields the honor of having originated the Congress, to New York; but, unaccountably, it assigns it, in New York, sometimes to an imaginary "old committee," which had ceased to exist when the Stamp-Act, which had called it into existence and to which its operations had been limited, was repealed, eight years previously, and sometimes to the eight or ten men who styled themselves and who were known as "the Sons of Lib-"erty," all of whom who were members of the Committee of Correspondence, appointed at the Coffee-house, were notoriously in accord with the men of Boston, who advocated an immediate suspension of the Commerce of the Continent and opposed the proposition to call a Congress for the general relief of all the Colonies. It is also well known, concerning those "Sons of Liberty" that, after 1766, they made no pretension that a permanent Committee existed; that their correspondence was conducted in their individual capacities, and not officially, as a Committee; that none of their correspondence, as far as it is now known, alluded to a Congress of the Colonies, for any purpose; and that their especially careful historian and eulogist, Isaac Q. Leake, not only made no such claim, in their behalf, but expressly and in unmistakable words, gave that honor to the Committee of Correspondence which had been appointed by the body of the inhabitants, at the Coffee-house. (*Memoir of the Life and Times of General John Lamb*, Albany: 1857, 88.) In the same author's centenary edition of that *History of the United States*, Boston: 1876, iv., 326, the same statement was made, without the slightest change; and Lodge's *History of the English Colonies*, New York: 1881, 489, without Bancroft's airy rhetoric, in a far more historical style than that historian employs, in some of his words, and without the slightest change in its substance, perpetuated the error.

Such are the guides which American scholarship, generally fettered with bonds of Roman and Grecian Literature, has given to the world, for the direction of those who shall aspire to the knowledge of a history of America. Such are some of the evidences of the entire untrustworthiness of the greater number of those who, satisfied with that "discipline" to which the Classics have subjected them and without having otherwise qualified themselves for the proper discharge of their honorable duties as historians of their own Country, have contented themselves, instead, by repeating what others, also fettered by similar obsolete prejudices and equally indolent, have written, and by willingly propagating the errors which local prejudices or indolence or a faulty education or ignorance have produced, while, with greater usefulness to the world and greater honor to themselves, they might rather have attempted to extirpate them.

[1] An evidence of that feeling may be seen in the letter from Thomas Young to John Lamb, dated "Boston, 19th June, 1774," in the "*Lamb* "*Papers*," New York Historical Society's Library.

[2] From the days of Doctor Gordon until the present time, as far as our knowledge extends, Hildreth is the only New Englander, among historical writers, who has inclined to tell the exact truth, on this subject; and what he said of it occupied less than two lines of an octavo page.

[3] The Caucus, at Sam. Francis's, at which the appointment of the Committee was determined on and its Members nominated, defined, in its first Resolution, the purposes for which that Committee was to be appointed and the authority which should be vested in it—"to corre-"spond with the neighboring Colonies on the present important Crisis," excluding all other subjects, (*Proceedings of the Meeting*, among the Broadsides, in the Library of the New-York Historical Society.)

[4] That James Duane and John Jay, to whom reference is here made, were not apt to recognize any fundamental obstruction to or requirement from whatever they should incline to do or not to do, is well known to every one who has closely studied the histories of the doings of those gentlemen, subsequently, in the various branches of official life to which they were respectively called.

[5] In all the political operations of that period, the several Counties of the Colonies were regarded as entirely independent bodies, each controlling itself to the extent, even, of sending independent Delegates to the Continental Congress—the centralization of authority, indeed, was the fundamental grievance against which all the Colonies were, then, raising their remonstrances and their opposition to the measures of the *Home* Government—and it must not be supposed that, in the instance referred to, in the text, the Committee sought the direct control of the masses, in any other County than in that of New York—it sought no more than to secure the control of those, within the several Counties, who did control those masses, within their several neighborhoods; and, therefore, it sought to

ments, at the second meeting of the Committee, on the evening of Monday, the thirtieth of May, Peter Van Schaack, Francis Lewis, John Jay, Alexander McDougal, and Theophilact Bache, three rigid conservatives and two of the revolutionary faction, were appointed "a Committee to write a Circular Letter to "the Supervisors in the different Counties, acquaint-"ing them of the appointment of this Committee, and "submitting to the consideration of the Inhabitants "of the Counties whether it could not be expedient for "them to appoint persons to correspond with this "Committee upon matters relative to the purposes for "which they were appointed;"[1] and, at a Meeting especially called for the purpose, on the following evening, [*Tuesday, May* 31,] at which thirty-five members were present, that Sub-Committee reported a Draft of a Circular Letter, for the purpose named, which was duly approved by the Committee. Mr. Lewis was ordered to cause three hundred copies of that Circular Letter to be printed; and it was also ordered that those printed copies of the letter should be transmitted, with all convenient speed, to the Treasurers of the several Counties, with a "line" to each Treasurer, signed by the Chairman of the Committee, requesting his care in the proper transmission of the several letters to the persons to whom they should be respectively addressed; and that intimation should be given, through the various Newspapers, that such Circular Letters had been duly sent.[2]

Of those Circular Letters, inviting a correspondence with the Committee, in New York, it is recorded that thirty copies were sent to the Treasurer of Westchester-county, with a note from the Chairman of the Committee, requesting him "to direct and forward "them to the Supervisors of the several Districts,"[3] the first attempt, which was made, by any one, to draw the farmers of that County into the unrest of discontent and disaffection; but we have failed to find, in any portion of the *Minutes of the Committee*, the slightest evidence that any one, within that County, paid the slightest attention to the Committee's insidious invitation, or that, at that time, any one to the northward of Kingsbridge, either within or without the limits of that County, seemed to possess the slightest interest in the Committee, or in the general purposes for which it had been appointed, or in those ill-concealed purposes for which it had covertly solicited the co-operation of the leaders, where there were any, throughout the Colony—certainly a very emphatic testimony to the accuracy of what has been stated, concerning the conservatism of the farmers in Westchester-county, as lately as in the Spring and early Summer of 1774.[4]

While the Committee of Correspondence, in New York, was thus engaged in an effort to extend its influence and its authority beyond the limits of its original jurisdiction, the Committee of Correspondence and the leaders of the revolutionary populace, in Boston, received and considered its letter responding to the Vote of that Town and to the letters which had accompanied it, to New York; and, as might have been reasonably expected, where the difference, on such a subject, was as radical in its character and as wide in its extent as it was in that instance, there appeared to be very little prospect of an agreement, or even of a compromise. Indeed, the Massachusettsmen did not appear to pay the slightest attention to the proposition which those of New York had made, to call a Congress of Deputies from all the Colonies, for the consideration of all the grievances, real or imaginary, of which all the Colonies were, then, respectively complaining, preferring, instead, and firmly insisting on, their own proposition to remove the particular case of Boston's recognized contumacy and its consequences from all other matters of disagreement with the Home Government, and to enforce a relief of that Town from the penalty inflicted on it, because of its recognized lawlessness, by establishing a Non-Importation and Non-Exportation Association, throughout the entire Continent, for that especial purpose, and for no other purpose whatever. That renewed preference of the Committee of Boston was conveyed to the Committee of New York, in a letter, dated on the thirtieth of May, which, in its terms, was not creditable to the professions of those who wrote it, for either candor, or honor, or genuine patri-

circumvent and secure the control of the entire Colony, under a mask of "patriotism," as it had already circumvented and secured the control, in political affairs, of the County of New York.

[1] *Minutes of the Committee*, "NEW-YORK, May 30, 1774;" *Lieutenant-governor Colden to Governor Tryon*, "NEW YORK, June 2, 1774."

[2] *Minutes of the Committee*, Special Meeting, "NEW-YORK, May 31, "1774;" *Lieutenant-governor Colden to Governor Tryon*, "NEW-YORK, "June 2, 1774."

[3] Memorandum, appended to the *Minutes of the Committee*, "NEW-"YORK, May 31, 1774."

[4] It appears that a similar temper prevailed in all the Counties of the Colony, except New York and Suffolk.

In a despatch from Lieutenant-governor Colden to the Earl of Dartmouth, dated "NEW YORK, 6th July 1774," it is stated, "The present "political zeal and Frenzy is almost entirely confined to the City of New "York. The People in the Counties are noways disposed to become ac-"tive or bear any part in what is proposed by the citizens. I am told "all the Counties but one have declined an Invitation sent them from "New York to appoint Committees of Correspondence. This Province "is everywhere, except in the City of New York, perfectly quiet and in "good order; and in New York a much greater freedom of Speech pre-"vails than has done heretofore."

In a letter written to Governor Tryon, dated "SPRING HILL, 6th July, "1774," the same careful observer said, further, "Except in the city of "New York, the People in the Province are quite Tranquile, and have "declin'd takeing any Part with the Citizens. An Opinion is spread very "generally in the Country that if a non-importation agreement is "form'd, Government will restrain our Exportation; a Measure which "the Farmers clearly see will be ruinous to them."

In a Despatch written to the Earl of Dartmouth, dated "NEW YORK, "2nd August, 1774," the venerable Lieutenant-governor stated, "Great "Pains has been taken in the several Counties of this Province to induce "the People to enter into Resolves, and to send Committees to join the "Committee in the city; but they have only prevailed in Suffolk County, "in the East End of Long Island which was settled from Connecticut, "and the Inhabitants still retain a great similarity of Manners and "Sentiments."

...ism;[1] and, in a letter dated on the seventh of June, ...e latter replied, disclaiming the slightest approval of the proposed "suspension of Trade," to which, very singularly and without the slightest reason, the Boston Committee had attempted to commit it; and saying, concerning that proposition. "We apprehend you have "made a mistake, for on revising our letter to you, so "far from finding a word mentioned of a 'Suspension "'of Trade,' the idea is not even conceived. That, and "every other Resolution, we have thought it most pru-"dent to leave for the discussion of the proposed gene-"ral Congress."[2] It continued, in these very emphatic words: "Adhering, therefore, to *that* measure, as "most conducive to promote the grand system of "politics we all have in view, we have the pleasure "to acquaint you, that we shall be ready, on our part, "to meet, at any time and place that you shall think "fit to appoint, either of Deputies from the General "Assemblies or such other Deputies as shall be "chosen, not only to speak the Sentiments, but also to "pledge themselves for the Conduct of the People of "the respective Colonies they represent. We can "undertake to assure you, in behalf of the People of "this Colony, that they will readily agree to any "measure that shall be adopted by the general Con-"gress. It will be necessary that you give a sufficient "time for the Deputies of the Colonies, as far south-"ward as the Carolinas, to assemble, and acquaint "them, as soon as possible, with the proposed "measure of a Congress. Your letters to the south-"ward of us, we will forward, with great pleasure."[3]

Those of the revolutionary leaders, in Boston, who had assumed the role of a Committee of Correspondence, in that Town, could not long conceal from the world the reckless falsity of what they had written to the Committee in New York, when they stated to the latter that, "certainly all that can be depended upon "to yield any effectual relief" to the Town of Boston, "is, on all hands, acknowledged to be the Suspension "of Trade." The letters which were received by the Committee of that Town, in answer to the Circular Letters, which had been sent to the seaport Towns of Massachusetts[4] and to the Committees of Correspondence in the several Colonies,[5] since the reception of the Boston Port-Bill, were not, as is now well known, really as unanimous, in favor of a "Suspension of "Trade," as the Committee had unblushingly pretended—indeed, with a few unimportant exceptions, the proposal to make Boston the only subject of consideration, throughout the Continent, and to suspend all the internal industries and, with the exception of Smuggling, all the Commerce of all the Colonies, only for the special benefit of that one Town, regardless of the more direct and substantial grievances which were sustained by other Towns and other Colonies, and regardless, also, of the very serious consequences, throughout the entire Continent and elsewhere, of such a general and indiscriminate "Suspension of "Trade" as had been proposed, and that, too, at the expense of a Congress of the Continent, which the Committee in New York had proposed and insisted on, in which all the grievances of all the Towns and Colonies could be considered, and remedies therefor be duly provided, had met with no favor whatever; and the audacious leaders of the revolutionary populace, in Boston, as well as the Town itself were not slow in receding, with more agility than candor, from that high and untenable position which they had occupied, in the proceedings of the Caucus held at Faneuil-Hall, on the twelfth of May, in the proceedings of the Town of Boston, at the same place, on the fol-

[1] The contents of that letter and the spirit of those who wrote it can be ascertained from the extracts from it which were copied into the letter, and evidently referred to in the action of those who wrote it, when, on the seventh of June, the Committee of New York replied to that second letter from Boston.

[2] The Resolution of the Committee in New York, on which that reply was based, is in these words: "ORDERED, That the Committee of Boston "be requested to give this Committee the Names of the Persons who "constitute the Committee of Correspondence at Boston; that they have "made a mistake in answering this Committee's letter, which mentioned "not a word of a Suspension of Trade, which they say we have so "wisely defined, as we leave that measure entirely to the Congress, and "we shall readily agree to any measure they shall adopt."

It is very evident that the suspicions of the Committee of New York were aroused by the evident trickery of the Committee of Boston, presented in its reply to the letter of the former, dated the twenty-third of May; and that, for that reason, it desired to learn the names of those with whom it was corresponding—their characters and standing could, then, be ascertained through other means.

[3] Copy of the letter, appended to the *Minutes of the Committee of Correspondence of New York*, "NEW-YORK, June 6, 1774."

[4] The Committees who had been sent to Salem and Marblehead, "to communicate the Sentiments of this Metropolis to the Gentlemen, "there; to consult with them; and to report at the adjournment," (*Minutes of the Town-Meeting, of Boston, May 13, 1774,*) did, indeed, go to those Towns, and report the results of their visits, to the Town, at its Adjourned Meeting, five days subsequently; but those results were so discouraging to the violently disposed leaders of Boston—including Samuel Adams, Joseph Warren, and their associates—that they contented themselves with ostentatiously "recommending to their fellow-citizens, "Patience, Fortitude, and a firm Trust in God," without making record of the formal Reports of the Committees, if any such formal Reports were really made, (*Minutes of the Adjourned Meeting of the Town, May 18, 1774,*) and with adjourning, a second time, until the thirty-first, "by which "time it is expected we shall have encouraging News from some of the "sister Colonies," to recompense them for the disappointment they had experienced from the results of their conferences with the Merchants of Newburyport and Salem.

The substance of the Reports from the Committees sent to the seaport Towns of the Province, all mention of which was thus suppressed by the Town-Clerk, was saved to the world, however, in a *Despatch from Governor Gage to the Earl of Dartmouth, dated* "BOSTON: May 19, 1774," and laid before the Parliament, on the nineteenth of January, 1775, in which it was said the Town-Meeting "appointed Persons to go to Marblehead "and Salem, to communicate their Sentiments to the People there, and "bring them into like Measures; which Persons were to make their "Report at the Adjournment, on the 18th, when the Meeting was again "held, and, I am told, received little encouragement from Salem and "Marblehead, and transacted nothing of consequence."—(*Parliamentary Register*, i., 36.)

[5] The first responses from other Colonies which the Committee received were those, carried by Paul Revere, from Philadelphia and New York, which were anything else than "encouraging" to such as composed that Committee; and there can be very little doubt, in the light of what was done, very soon afterwards, in Connecticut and Rhode Island, that Revere carried back, from Hartford and Providence, tokens of what might be expected from those Colonies, also, in opposition to the remarkable propositions of the Caucus of Town-Committees, in Faneuil-Hall, and of the Town of Boston, on the following day.

lowing day, and in the letters from the Committee of Correspondence, covering the proceedings of the Town, which were sent to the Committee in New York, on the following Saturday, as has been, herein, already stated.

The world of historical literature has been favored, in this connection, by one of the most painstaking and accurate of Massachusetts' historians, with a revelation of the trickery and double-dealing of at least one of those who, in the matter now under consideration, have been justly regarded as the leaders of the political elements, within that Colony, which were antagonistic to the Colonial and the Home Governments.

Samuel Adams was the Chairman and master-spirit of the Committee of Correspondence in Boston: he was the Chairman of the Caucus of the nine Town-Committees, assembled in Faneuil-Hall, which had confirmed the line of action, concerning the Boston Port-Bill, which he and the men of Boston, had already contrived: he was the Moderator of the Town-Meeting, at Faneuil-Hall, continued through three days, in which that line of action was adopted and pursued and insisted on: and he inspired, if he did not personally write, those letters, describing and insisting on that line of action, which were sent from Boston, to the Committee in New York, in the saddle-bag of Paul Revere, of which mention has been made herein—all of them, Committees, Caucuses, Town-Meetings, and Letters, being radically in favor of the Boston plan of a "Suspension of Trade," especially for Boston's benefit, and quite as radically resisting the proposal to call "a general Congress," for general purposes. He was the Chairman and master-spirit of that local Committee of the Town which, on the thirtieth of May, addressed that letter to the Committee of Correspondence in New York, adhering to the plan of a Non-Importation Association which Boston had previously proposed, instead of the convention of a federal Congress which New York had previously proposed; and attempting, by indirect means, to commit the Committee in New York to the support of the Boston plan of Non-Importation, at the expense of its own plan of calling a federal Congress, of which letter and insidious attempt to commit the New York Committee to the Boston scheme, mention has been made. Besides all these, he was the Chairman and the master spirit of that Committee, in Boston, which, as lately as the eighth of June, sent Circular Letters from that Town to every Town in the Commonwealth, in which it was stated that "there is "but one way that we can conceive of, to prevent "what is to be deprecated by all good men, and ought, "by all possible means, to be prevented, viz: The "horrours that must follow an open rupture between "Great Britain and her Colonies, or, on our part, a "subjugation to absolute Slavery; and that is by af-"fecting the Trade and Interest of Great Britain so "deeply as shall induce her to withdraw her oppressive hand" [1]—which the Committee proposed to do by means of an *Association* providing "that, hence-"forth, we will suspend all commercial intercourse "with the said Island of Great Britain, until the said "Act for blocking up the said Harbour" [*of Boston*] "be repealed, and a full restoration of our Charter "Rights be obtained." [2] But we are told by that generally trustworthy historian,[3] that that same Samuel Adams, who was thus inspiring and leading and controlling the men of Boston, in their earnest opposition to a general Congress for a general consideration of the grievances of all who were aggrieved, and whose convictions were supposed to have been in harmony with his pretensions before the world, was really in favor of such a Congress and, consequently, really opposed to the principles which were presented and urged by the Committees, by the Caucus, and by the Town-Meeting, all of whom he had controlled, in the Resolutions, the Letters, and the *Address* and *Association* of which mention has been made, all of which he is known to have inspired and some of which he wrote; that, as early as the twenty-sixth of May, he "was about to introduce Resolves for such a Congress," into the House of Representatives, of which he was the Clerk; and that he was prevented from doing so, only by the prorogation of the House, by the Governor.

If this statement is well-founded, and the name of its author affords a reasonable guaranty that it is so, the world of historical literature will be taught by it, how much the personal character of Samuel Adams has been unduly eulogized; and every careful reader will also be taught by that new revelation, how much the Clerk of the House of Representatives, in Colonial Massachusetts, while he was only an employé of the House, presumed to dictate, in matters of legislation, during that critical period; with how much of insincerity the leader of the excited people, in that Colony, acted, in all that he said and did, before that people and in their behalf; and, in connection with the recognized "art" and duplicity with which the leaders in New York were, also, then conducting, or endeavoring to conduct, the political affairs of the Continent, how little of real personal integrity, of unqualified unselfishness, and of unalloyed patriotism, really controlled or even existed among those, in Massachusetts and New York, who, sensibly or insensibly, were, at that time, conducting the Continent in open insurrection, toward a successful rebellion.

The letters of disapproval and discouragement,

[1] *Address sent by the Boston Committee to every Town in the Province*, dated "BOSTON, June 8, 1774," reprinted in Force's *American Archives*, Fourth Series, i., 397.

[2] *Form of a Covenant, sent to every Town in Massachusetts, by the Committee in Boston*, with the above-mentioned *Address*, Section 1st.

[3] Richard Frothingham of Charlestown, in his *Rise of the Republic of the United States*, Boston: 1872, 323, whose words are as follows:

"The Massachusetts Assembly convened on the twenty-fifth of May. "Samuel Adams was about to introduce Resolves for a Congress when "the Assembly (26th) was adjourned by the Governor to meet in Salem "on the seventh of June."

against the line of action proposed and solicited by the Town of Boston, in its formal Vote, on the thirteenth of May, of which Samuel Adams was the originator and by whom, as the Moderator of the Town-Meeting, its passage had been secured, continued to flow into that Town, from all directions,[1] carrying with them an influence, with that shrewd politician, which was more potential than all the enactments of the Parliament and all the power of the Home and the Colonial Governments had produced; and he was not slow in accepting the alternative which those letters and the evident danger of a more complete isolation of the Town of Boston than he had supposed to have been possible, had sternly thrust upon him. Accordingly, on the seventeenth of June, the House of Representatives, assembled at Salem, more or less under the guidance of its Clerk, adopted a Resolution declaring that "a Meeting of "Committees from the several Colonies on this Con-"tinent is highly expedient and necessary, to con-"sult upon the present State of the Colonies and "the Miseries to which they are and must be reduced "by the operation of certain Acts of Parliament re-"specting America; and to deliberate and determine "upon wise and proper Measures to be by them "recommended to all the Colonies, for the recovery "and establishment of their just Rights and Liber-"ties, civil and religious, and the restoration "of Union and Harmony between Great Britain "and the Colonies, most ardently desired by all "good Men." At the same time, five persons, of whom Samuel Adams was one, "were ap-"pointed a Committee, on the part of this Province, "for the Purposes aforesaid, any three of whom to be "a Quorum, to meet such Committees or Delegates "from the other Colonies as have been or may be ap-"pointed either by their respective Houses of Bur-"gesses or Representatives, or by Conventions, or by "the Committees of Correspondence appointed by "the respective Houses of Assembly, to meet in the "City of Philadelphia, or any other Place that shall "be judged most suitable by the Committee, on the "first Day of September next; and that the Speaker "of the House be directed, in a Letter to the Speakers "of the Houses of Burgesses or Representatives in "the several Colonies, to inform them of the sub-"stance of these Resolves."[2]

At the same time that the House of Representatives, at Salem, was thus adding the weight of its official judgment against the line of action proposed and solicited by the Town of Boston and in support of that proposed and insisted on by the Committee in New York, the former, also, in a duly assembled Town-Meeting, John Adams occupying the Chair, in seeming forgetfulness of its Vote, on the thirteenth of the preceding month, willingly or unwillingly, formally wheeled into the line of the general opposition to the Home Government, under the guidance of that foreign Committee; and, without making the slightest allusion to her ill-conceived and injudicious action, in her adoption of that Vote, the Town "en-"joined" the Committee of Correspondence, "forth-"with, to write to all the other Colonies, acquainting "them that we are waiting with anxious expectation "for the Result of a Continental Congress, whose "Meeting we impatiently desire, in whose Wisdom "and Firmness we can confide, and in whose Deter-"mination we shall cheerfully acquiesce"[3]—a change of policy which was, in the highest degree, remarkable, and which would be entirely unaccountable were the capabilities of Massachusetts-men, of every period, for making remarkable changes of policy and of action, whenever their material interests have seemed to call for such changes, less known to the great world in which we live.

The Committee of Correspondence in New York having, meanwhile, received assurances of their approval of its proposition to invite a meeting of Deputies from the several Colonies, in a Continental Congress, from the Committee of Correspondence of Connecticut[4] and from that in Philadelphia[5]—with the knowledge, also, that the "Standing Committee of "Correspondence," which the General Assembly of the Colony of New York had appointed, on the twentieth of January, 1774, had also approved and concurred in that proposition,[6] and, undoubtedly, although informally,[7] with information of the action of the Town of Boston and of that of the House of Representatives of Massachusetts, on the same subject,—on the twenty-seventh of June, it entertained and "debated"

[1] *Despatch from Governor Gage to the Earl of Dartmouth*, "BOSTON, 31st "*May*, 1774," laid before Parliament, on the nineteenth of January, 1775 —(*Parliamentary Register*, i., 36.)

[2] *Journal of the House of Representatives*, June 17, 1774.

[3] *Proceedings of the Adjourned Town-Meeting*, June 17, 1774, reprinted in Force's *American Archives*, Fourth Series, i., 423.

[4] *The Committee of Correspondence for Connecticut to the Committee in New York*, "HARTFORD, June 4, 1774," enclosing a letter, to the same effect, which had been sent by the Committee in Hartford to the Committee in Boston, on the preceding day.

[5] *Proceedings of a Meeting of the Freeholders and Freemen of the City and County of Philadelphia, Saturday, June* 18, 1774, enclosed in a letter from the Committee of Correspondence in Philadelphia to the Committee in New York, "PHILADELPHIA, 21st June, 1774."

[6] That Committee of the Assembly was composed of John Cruger, Frederick Philipse, Isaac Wilkins, Benjamin Seaman, James Jauncey, James De Lancey, Jacob Walton, Simeon Beerum, John De Noyelles, George Clinton, Daniel Kissam, Zebulon Williams, and John Rapalje, the names of ten of whom, including that of Frederick Philipse of Westchester-county, are appended to a letter, addressed to the Committee of Correspondence of Connecticut, dated "NEW YORK, June 24, 1774," in which it "agrees with you, that, at this alarming juncture, a general "Congress of Deputies from the several Colonies would be a very expe-"dient and salutary measure," regretting, however, that it was "not "sufficiently empowered to take any steps in relation to so salutary a "measure."

[7] *The Minutes of the Committee* in New York, notwithstanding the carefully made record of the letters which were received by it, make no mention whatever of its receipt of letters from either the Town of Boston or the House of Representatives of Massachusetts, on any subject, after its receipt of that, from the former, dated the thirtieth of May; and it may, therefore, be reasonably supposed that whatever knowledge the Committee then possessed, concerning the political sentiment of the Massachusetts-men, was unofficial and informal.

a Resolution, offered by Alexander McDougal, concerning "which was the most eligible mode of appointing Deputies to attend the ensuing General "Congress."[1]

In submitting that Resolution, which had not received the imprimatur of those who represented the majority of the Committee, and, for that reason, was not received with any favor by that majority, it is evident that Alexander McDougal acted in behalf of the minority of that body—of those of its members who had been selected from the revolutionary faction of the Tradesmen, Mechanics, and Workingmen of the City—and it is evident, also, that the purpose of that minority was to secure to "the Committee of Mechanics," which, notwithstanding its formal acquiescence in the appointment of the Committee of Correspondence, continued to assume authority to represent the unfranchised portion of the people, in all which related to their political action, a right to concur in or to reject any nomination of Delegates to the proposed Congress, which the Committee of Correspondence should determine to make. The struggle between the two factions, within the Committee, was continued to an Adjourned Meeting of that body, on the evening of the twenty-ninth of June, when Alexander McDougal moved "that this Committee proceed, immediately, to nominate five Deputies for the City "and County of New York, to represent them in a "Convention of this Colony,[2] or in the general Congress, to be held at Philadelphia, on the first of "September next, if the other Counties of this Colony approve of them as Deputies for the Colony; "and that their names be sent to the Committee of "Mechanics, for their concurrence; to be proposed on "Tuesday next, to the Freeholders and Freemen of "this City and County, for their approbation." Without having reached a vote on that Resolution, however, the Committee adjourned to the following Monday evening, the fourth of July;[3] at which time, after another severe struggle, the Resolution was rejected, by a formal vote of thirteen in support of it and twenty-four in opposition thereto. Immediately afterwards, without a division, on the motion of Theophilact Bache, seconded by John De Lancey, the Committee resolved "to nominate five persons, to "meet in a general Congress, at the time and place "which shall be agreed on by the other Colonies; and "that the Freeholders and Freemen of the City and "County of New York be summoned to appear at a "convenient place, to approve or disapprove of such "persons, for this salutary purpose; also, that this "Committee write Circular Letters to the Supervisors of the several Counties, informing them what "we have done, and to request of them to send such "Delegates as they may choose, to represent them in "Congress"—a Resolution which was so general in its terms, that, in a body which was composed, exclusively, of those who, politically, were in opposition to the Home Government, there was no room for opposition to it, notwithstanding its silence concerning the Committee of Mechanics and the claim which had been made in its behalf;[4] but it was, also, one which laid the foundation for further and very important action, in which the bitterness of feeling, concerning the distribution of the proposed offices, which continued to exist between the rival factions of the con-

[1] *Minutes of the Committee*, "New-York, June 27, 1774."

It has been said, (de Lancey's *Notes* to Jones's *History of New York during the Revolutionary War*, i., 449,) that "the Committee met to consider" that Resolution, but that would indicate that the Resolution was submitted to the previous Meeting, which is contradicted by the *Minutes*. It is clear, as we understand the record, that Alexander McDougal offered it, for consideration, only at the Meeting on the twenty-seventh of June.

[2] This portion of the Resolution evidently looked for the establishment of a Provincial Congress or Convention, in which should be vested supreme and arbitrary power, without limitation, over the persons and properties and actions and thoughts and convictions of every one within the Colony; overthrowing all Government; cancelling all Rights of Persons and Properties; and establishing, in their stead, an active scourging Despotism. Such an one was, soon afterwards, established; but, just at the time under consideration, the master spirits of the majority of the Committee had not secured the places to which they were aspiring; and, for that reason, they were not, then, ready to concur in that revolutionary, ultra revolutionary, measure.

[3] *Minutes of the Adjourned Meeting of the Committee*, "NEW-YORK, June "29, 1774."

[4] It is proper to remind the reader, in this place, of two well-known facts, each of which had an important bearing on the political events of the period now under consideration.

The first of these facts is, the "friends of the Government" took no part whatever, in the formation of the Committee of Correspondence nor in its doings. That body was denounced by the Colonial Government, from the beginning, as "illegal"—"it is allowed by the Intelligent among them, that these assemblies of the People without authority of Government are illegal and may be dangerous," (*Lieutenant-governor Colden to the Earl of Dartmouth*, "NEW YORK 1st June 1774.") "These transactions" [*the nomination of Deputies to the Congress and the proposed ratification of the ticket by the body of the people*] "are dangerous, "my Lord, and illegal, but by what means shall Government prevent "them? An attempt by the power of the Civil Magistrate would only "show their weakness, and it is not easy to say upon what foundation a "military aid should be called in. Such a Measure would involve us in "Troubles which it is thought much more prudent to avoid; and to shun "all Extremes while it is yet possible Things may take a favourable "turn."—(*The same to the same*, "NEW YORK, 6th July, 1774.")

The party of the Government—subsequently called "Tories"—included only the members of the Colonial Government, in its various departments, and its dependents; it was, unwillingly, only a passive spectator of what, then, took place, in the political doings of that period; and it was wholly powerless to suppress the rising spirit of Revolution, which it would have gladly done. The party of the Opposition to the Government—subsequently called "Whigs"—included the great body of the inhabitants, aristocratic as well as democratic, the patricians as well as the plebeians. It was cut up into factions, based on social and financial standings; but, in its opposition to the Government, it was united and determined.

The second of the facts referred to is, at the time under consideration and during the succeeding half century, as we have already stated (*vide pages* 4, 5, *ante*,) those who were not Freeholders or Freemen of a Municipality, were not vested with the right of suffrage, in any of the Colonies; and it need not be a matter of surprise that, at that early day, the great body of the Freeholders and Freemen, in New York, was not inclined to permit any interference, in political affairs, by those who were not, legally, entitled to take part in them. Indeed, the rule of universal suffrage is not, to-day, generally recognized; and one State, in New England, if no more, continues to make a division of her citizens, at the Polls.

federated party of the Opposition, notwithstanding their apparent harmony on other questions, was promptly and very energetically displayed.

The Resolution offered by Theophilact Bache had no sooner been declared to have been carried, than Isaac Sears, seconded by Peter Van Brugh Livingston, representing the minority of the Committee, offered another Resolution, providing "that Messrs. "Isaac Low, James Duane, Philip Livingston, John "Morin Scott, and Alexander McDougal be nomi-"nated, agreeable to the question now carried;" but it was not the intention of the aristocratic, conservative majority of the Committee that the plebeian, revolutionary minority of that body should have the slightest representation in the proposed Delegation; and, notwithstanding its seeming fairness, the Resolution was promptly rejected, by a vote of twelve to twenty-five. The subject was subsequently disposed of, as it then appeared, by a Resolution, offered by John De Lancey and seconded by Benjamin Booth, providing for the nomination of the Delegates by the body of the Committee, of which the conservative aristocrats held the entire control, which resulted in the nomination of Philip Livingston, John Alsop, Isaac Low, James Duane, and John Jay, of whom John Alsop and John Jay, who had been substituted for the two candidates of the minority, John Morin Scott and Alexander McDougal, by reason of their known peculiarly conservative tendencies, were especially obnoxious to that revolutionary minority, as well as to the revolutionary portion of the unfranchised masses whom that minority indirectly represented. Another Resolution, requesting "the Inhab-"itants of this City and County to meet at the City-"Hall on Thursday, the seventh of July, at twelve "o'clock, to concur in the Nomination of the fore-"going five Persons, or to choose such others in their "stead as in their wisdom shall seem meet," was then adopted; and, the majority, probably, being well-contented with its apparent success, the Committee then adjourned.[1]

The minority of the Committee and those with whom it sympathized and acted, in political affairs—the "Bellwethers" and the "Sheep" of Gouverneur Morris's metaphor—were not inclined, however, to submit, tamely, to the arbitrary dictation of their "Shepherds," composing the majority of that body; and they promptly determined to carry the contest into a new field, and with heavy reinforcements. For that purpose, anonymous handbills were posted throughout the City,[2] on the day after the Committee's Meeting, calling a Meeting of "the good People "of this Metropolis," to be held in the Fields,[3] on the following day, [*Wednesday, July 6*] at six o'clock, "when Matters of the utmost Importance to their "Reputation and Security, as Freemen, will be com-"municated." At the appointed hour, it is said, "a "numerous meeting" was collected, with Alexander McDougal in the Chair, forming what continues to be known, in history, as "the great Meeting in the "Fields," at which several Speeches were made,[4] and nine Resolutions adopted, expressing the popular will.

One of the Resolutions adopted by that notable assemblage of the inhabitants of the City of New York, was almost identical, in words and sentiments, with that voted by the Town of Boston, on the thirteenth of May, of which mention has been made herein; another "instructed, empowered, and directed" the Deputies from New York, in the proposed Congress, "to engage with a majority of the principal "Colonies, to agree, for this City, upon a non-impor-"tation, from Great Britain, of all Goods, Wares, and "Merchandises, until the Act for blocking up the "Harbour of Boston be repealed, and American "Grievances be redressed; and, also, to agree to all "such other measures as the Congress shall, in their "Wisdom, judge advancive of these great Objects, "and a general Security of the Rights and Privileges "of America;" and another pledged the Meeting to abide by all that the proposed Congress should "come into, and direct or recommend to be done, "for obtaining and securing the important ends men-"tioned in the foregoing Resolutions." It also resolved "that it is the opinion of this Meeting that "it would be proper for every County in the Colony, "without delay, to send two Deputies, chosen by the "People or from the Committees chosen by them, in "each County, to hold, in conjunction with Deputies "for this City and County, a Convention for the "Colony, on a day to be appointed, in order to elect "a proper Number of Deputies to represent the Col-

[1] *Minutes of the Committee*, Adjourned Meeting, "NEW YORK, July 4, "1774."

See, also, *Lieutenant-governor Colden to the Earl of Dartmouth*, "NEW "YORK, July 6, 1774;" *the same to Governor Tryon*, "SPRING HILL, 6th "July, 1774."

[2] One of those handbills has been preserved and may be seen, among other broadsides of that period, in the Library of the New York Historical Society.

[3] What were then called, sometimes, "The Fields," and, at other times, "The Common," on which has occurred so much of public interest, in later as well as in earlier days, have been called, during more than half a century past, "The Park;" and by that name it is still known, notwithstanding the greater attractions which, for some years past, have been presented to merely pleasure seekers, in the new pleasure-grounds known as "The Central Park."

[4] Among the speakers at that Meeting, it has been usual, for some years past, to give a prominent place to Alexander Hamilton, then a mere lad, who had been thrown into this City, a few years previously, by those, in the West Indies, who, for domestic if not for social reasons, had desired his removal from the place of his nativity. As there is no contemporary authority for such a favor to the previously questionable reputation of that "young West Indian," however, and because the only modern authority for the statement is the young man's son, John C. Hamilton, (*Life of Alexander Hamilton*, by his son, New York: 1849, i. 22, 23,) in whose unsupported testimony, in historical subjects, we have no confidence whatever, we prefer to leave that portion of the history of "the "great Meeting," if it is truly such a portion of it, where those who were present and who recorded the doings of the great assemblage then left it, entirely untold.

"ony in the general Congress. But that, if the "Counties shall conceive this mode impracticable or "inexpedient, they be requested to give their appro-"bation to the Deputies who shall be chosen for this "City and County, to represent the Colony in Con-"gress;" and it "instructed" "the City Committee of "Correspondence" "to use their utmost Endeavours "to carry these Resolutions into execution." After ordering the Resolutions to be printed in the public Newspapers of the City, and to be transmitted to the different Counties in the Colony and to the Committees of Correspondence for the neighboring Colonies, the Meeting then adjourned;[1] but its great influence was continued to be felt, long after the circumstances which had caused it to be assembled had passed from the memories of those who were present and who participated in its doings.

Inspired by the strength and the spirit of the Meeting in the Fields, and led in their opposition to the majority of the Committee, by all the old-time experienced popular leaders, the "Inhabitants of the City "and County," of every class, met, agreeably to the published request of the Committee of Correspondence, at the City Hall, at noon, on the day after those Inhabitants had assembled in the Fields; but they did not confirm the Committee's Nominations, for Deputies to the proposed Congress; and the utmost bad feeling, between the aristocratic majority of the Committee and the great body of the plebeian Tradesmen, Artisans, and Workingmen, whom it had betrayed, prevailed throughout the city.[2]

It is not within the purposes of this work, however, to present a narrative of the various movements and counter-movements of the rival factions of the confederated party of the Opposition, again disunited, in their determined struggle for supremacy—nominally, for the establishment of their respective principles, in opposition to or in support of a general "Suspen-"sion of Trade," but, really, for places on the ticket for Delegates to the proposed Congress of the Continent—which was continued, without ceasing, from the seventh until the twenty-seventh of July;[3] and which was terminated, on the last-mentioned day, only after Philip Livingston, Isaac Low, John Alsop, and John Jay, four of the nominees of the aristocratic and conservative Committee of Correspondence, had inconsistently and venally declared, in direct contradiction of the constantly declared policy of that Committee, previously concurred in by themselves, that "a general Non-Importation Agreement, faith-"fully observed, would prove the most efficacious "Measure to procure a Redress of our Grievances,"[4] which had been the peculiarly distinguishing feature in the declared policy of the revolutionary faction, in the City of New York, as well as in that of the similar faction, in Boston; and after those four of the nominees of the Committee had thus practically abandoned their aristocratic and anti-revolutionary associates; withdrawn from the Committee which they had largely assisted in organizing and by whom they had been nominated; and united with those whom they personally despised and by whom they were quite as earnestly distrusted and despised—when, after the fashion of such corrupt political alliances, then and since—the way was prepared for a peaceful Election of the nominees of the Committee,[5] four of whom no longer represented the declared policy of the Committee; and one, if not more of the number was more of a Spy, in the service of the Colonial Government, than anything else.

It will be seen that James Duane did not disgrace himself or his name by placing the latter, with those of his four aristocratic associates on the ticket for Delegates to the proposed Congress, on the letter through which those four bartered the little of political and personal integrity and the modicum of unselfish principles which they respectively possessed, for a small mess of very thin official pottage; and, in that instance, his backwardness was honorable and timely, since there is every reason for the belief that, at that time, he was not master of himself; that he had, already, been purchased by another; and that, then, he was, in fact, only the servant of his master.

History has revealed[6] what, otherwise, would have remained, concealed, in the files of the *Colonial Land Papers*, in the Secretary's Office, in Albany,[7] concern-

---

[1] *Proceedings of the Meeting*, appended to the *Minutes of the Committee of Correspondence*, "NEW YORK, July 7, 1774."

See, also, Holt's *New-York Journal*, No. 1614, NEW-YORK, Thursday, July 7, 1774; Gaine's *New-York Gazette and Mercury*, No. 1185, NEW-YORK, Monday, July 11, 1774; *Rivington's New-York Gazetteer*, No. 65, NEW-YORK, Thursday, July 14, 1774; *Lieutenant-governor Colden to Governor Tryon*, "SPRING HILL, 2nd August, 1774;" Hamilton's *Life of Alexander Hamilton*, i, 21-23; Dawson's *Park and its Vicinity*, 34-37; Dunlap's *History of New-York*, i, 453; Bancroft's *History of the United States*, original edition, vii., 79, 80; *the same*, centenary edition, iv., 355, 356; de Lancey's *Notes* to Jones's *History of New York during the Revolutionary War*, i., 451.

[2] *Minutes of the Committee*, July 7, 13, 19, 25, and 27, 1774; Dunlap's *History of New York*, i., 453; Hildreth's *History of the United States*, First Series, iii., 39; Bancroft's *History of the United States*, original edition, vii., 80, 81; *the same*, centenary edition, iv., 356, 357; Leake's *Memoir of General Lamb*, 93; de Lancey's *Notes* on Jones's *History of New York during the Revolutionary War*, i., 451-466.

[3] Decidedly the most complete narrative of that notable factional struggle may be seen in de Lancey's *Notes, etc.* on Jones's *History of New York during the Revolutionary War*, (i., 449-467,) which has been prepared with great labor, and which contains carefully-made copies of many of the original handbills and placards which were, then, scattered throughout the city.

[4] *Philip Livingston, John Alsop, Isaac Low, and John Jay to Abraham Brasher, Theophilus Anthony, Francis Van Dyck, Jeremiah Platt, and Christopher Luyckinck*, "NEW YORK, July 26, 1774."

[5] *Proceedings of "a Meeting of a number of Citizens convened at the "House of Mr. Mariner,"* at which the nominations by the Committee of Correspondence were acquiesced in, by those who assumed to represent the unfranchised inhabitants of the City, "NEW YORK, 27 July, "1774."

[6] "Duane, justly eminent as a lawyer, was embarrassed by large spec-"ulations in Vermont lands, from which he could derive no profit, but "through the power of the Crown."—(Bancroft's *History of the United States*, original edition, vii., 79; *the same*, centenary edition, iv., 355.)

[7] *New York Colonial Manuscripts indorsed* "Land Papers," *in the Office of the Secretary of State, at Albany*, xxiii., 100; xix., 68; xx., 168, 169;

ing his speculations in the Crown lands, in New York and Vermont, to secure entire success in which the countenance of the Colonial Government was needed and had been secured; and the intimacy of his personal relations with the head of that Government, the venerable Cadwallader Colden,[1] and the remarkable similiarity of his views concerning the leading political questions of the day, among which the demand for a suspension of the trade of the Colonies with the Mother Country was one of the most prominent, and those, on the same questions, which were maintained by that unusually zealous servant of the King, are also well known to every careful reader of that portion of the political history of the Colony. Indeed, in the latter connection, it is known that, subsequently to his election as a Delegate to the Congress, and before he left New York, to take his seat in that body, as the trusted Envoy of all the inhabitants of that City, nominally charged with the great and honorable duty of seeking, in their behalf, a redress of the political grievances which had been imposed upon them by the Home Government, he visited and confidentially compared notes, on political subjects, with, if he did not also communicate information to, the official representative of that Government, in New York;[2] and, with that fact established, even in the absence of direct and positive testimony thereon, it would not be unreasonable to suppose or to say that specific lines of action, in the interest of the Crown, which were subsequently followed, within that Congress, individually and in concert with other Delegates, were, also, considered, and canvassed, and determined on, during that interview. In harmony, also, with that evident connection of James Duane with the Colonial Government,—in support, also, of the suspicion that particular lines of action, in the interest of the Crown, to be taken in the Congress, were considered and determined on, in advance of the meeting of the Congress, by that particular Delegate and the venerable Lieutenant-governor of the Colony—reference need be made only to that other patent fact, that the Congress had no sooner closed its sessions, at Philadelphia, than he hastened to his master, in New York, and reported to that anxious listener, for the use of the Ministry, in England, not only the doings of particular Delegations, in the Congress, and those of the Congress itself, but his own general dissent from the proceedings, his request that that dissent should be entered on the Journal, and the absolute refusal of permission to have that privilege given to him, all of which were thus communicated in open violation of his promise "to keep the Proceedings secret, until "the Majority shall direct them to be made Publick."[3] Indeed, he and Joseph Galloway, of Philadelphia, the latter of whom, also, had been a Delegate in the Congress, visited Lieutenant-governor Colden, soon after the adjournment of that body, and communicated to that distinguished member of the Government, all that he desired to know of the entire subject, not sparing even those portions of the proceedings of the Congress which it regarded as too delicate to be submitted to the light of day, in its subsequently published *Journal*;[4] and that, too, in the face of the notorious fact that each had already assented to and signed the *Association of Non-Importation* which the Congress had adopted,[5] which, *prima-facie*, carried with it, in each instance, to his constituents and to the world, a guaranty of his faithful discharge of the duties connected with the great trust which had been laid upon him; but, when regarded as only one of the links of a chain of evidence, concerning his entire conduct, in the political events of that period, it is one which, until the end of time, will establish the stern fact that James Duane, among others, was insincere, untrustworthy, and dishonest, as a man and as a politician.

The Colonial Government was decidedly and peculiarly opposed to the adoption of any measure, either by the people or the Congress, which would possibly disturb the Trade and Commerce of Great Britain; and James Duane, a dependent on that Government, was not at liberty to sign such a letter, approving the establishment of a Non-Importation Agreement, as that which his four associates on the aristocratic ticket, thus smeared with corruption, had signed, even if the consequence had been a sacrifice

xxi., 10, 95; xxii., 15; xxxiii., 19, 41; xxvii., 17; and the many papers, concerning Duanesburg, of which he was a principal Proprietor.

[1] He was the Clerk of the Colonial Court of Chancery; he was, often, the retained Counsel of the Colonial Government (*Opinions of Counsel in the Matter of Cunningham, Appellant, against Forsey*, and in the *Matter of Charges against Judge Wells*;) he was the Counsel of the Lieutenant-governor, in the celebrated Suit, in Chancery, concerning a division of the Fees of his office, with the Earl of Dunmore, (Letters, etc., in the *Matter of the Attorney-general* pro Rege *against Colden*;) and the tone and the terms of the letters which passed between them, as they have been preserved in "*the Colden Papers*," in the Library of the New York Historical Society, leave no room for doubt on the subject.

[2] "By my Letter of the 7th of September your Lordship would find I "entertained Hopes that the People of this Province would adopt moderate Measures and avoid giving any new offence to the Parliament. I "know such were the sentiments of Farmers and Country People in "general who make a great Majority of the Inhabitants. I had a confidential conference with one of the Delegates sent from this city to the "Congress now met at Philadelphia who I thought had as much influence as any from this place, and he gave me assurances of his disposition "being similar."—(*Lieutenant-governor Colden to the Earl of Dartmouth*, No. 7., "NEW YORK 5th October 1774.")

[3] The fourth Resolution or "*Rule of Conduct to be observed*," etc., is in these words: "RESOLVED: That the Doors be kept shut during the Time "of Business; and that the Members consider themselves under the "strongest Obligations of Honour to keep the Proceedings secret, until "the Majority shall direct them to be made Publick."—(*Journal of the Congress*, "Tuesday, September 6th, 1774, ten o'clock, A. M.")

[4] *The Despatch of Lieutenant-governor Colden to the Earl of Dartmouth* dated, "NEW YORK, December 7th, 1774," in which the Home Government was informed of these dishonorable revelations of the action of the Congress, is too extended to be copied into this Note. The reader is consequently referred to it.

[5] A carefully prepared fac-simile of the last sheet of that *Association*, which contained the signatures of the several Delegations—those of James Duane and Joseph Galloway being among them—may be seen in Force's *American Archives*, Fourth Series, i., opposite folios 915, 916.

of that opportunity to obtain, for himself, a seat in that Congress, a contingency which the Colonial Government was, probably, quite as anxious to avoid, and one which was evidently guarded against by means which were entirely effective. James Duane was not among those who were suddenly converted, in order to ensure their success at the Polls; but, nevertheless, on the day after the disgraceful political somersault of Philip Livingston, Isaac Low, John Alsop, and John Jay had been declared satisfactory by their plebeian and revolutionary auditory, that eminent adherent to the original policy of the Committee of Correspondence, as well as those who had so ignominiously abandoned it, was elected, at the Polls, by the unanimous vote of "the Inhabitants,"[1] affording an example, in political engineering, which has been too often followed, at the expense of individual integrity and of the good of the country, from that time until the present.

Perhaps the preceding detail belongs more properly to the political history of the commercial City of New York than to that of the purely agricultural County of Westchester; yet it would be impossible to present any narrative of the events of the Revolution which occurred within that portion of the Colony, which should pretend to completeness, or precision, or accuracy, without having previously explained the precise nature of those influences which were brought, from beyond the limits of the County, to undermine the fundamental and rigid conservatism of those staid, well-to-do, and contented farmers who occupied that County, and to draw any portion of them from the quiet of their rural homes into the seething vortex of partisan excitement, concerning measures of the Home Government which did not affect them nor their interests, in the slightest degree—a departure from the ways of their fathers, which, before many months had elapsed, transformed that quiet, and neighborly, and law-abiding community into one of entire unrest and disorder, of the most intense partisan bitterness, and of the most complete disregard of all law, human and divine; converting what had been a quiet, and well-cultivated, and productive agricultural region into one over which were spread the evidences of partisan lawlessness, of vigilant suspicion and distrust, of sullen neglect, and, too often, of hopeless and lamentable ruin. The purposes, apparent or concealed, of those who created the Committee of Correspondence in the City of New York; the purposes, published or withheld, of the Committee itself; and the purposes, generally well-concealed, of some of those who wielded the influence of that Committee, sometimes for the promotion of their individual and not always righteous interests and sometimes for the suppression of the aspirations of others which were quite as praiseworthy as their own, are, therefore, subjects which cannot be disregarded, in whatever relates to revolutionary Westchester-county, since it was that Committee, as has been already stated, who made the first assault on the long-established conservatism of the farmers of that ancient County—an assault which was made entirely unsuccessful by their sturdy disregard; since it was that Committee, returning to the assault and offering the tempting allurements of place and official authority to those who should break from the ranks of their conservative countrymen—who, as will hereinafter appear, by means of such corrupt allurements, first broke the line of those rural home-guards which had previously thrown back the power of the insidious invader; and because it was that Committee who called into existence, successively, the revolutionary Congress of the Continent and the yet more revolutionary Provincial Congress, whence, subsequently, flowed that torrent of disorders and disasters over which Westchester-county has not ceased to mourn, from that period until the present. These have been consequently presented, as briefly, however, as was consistent with perspicuity; and a more complete, and precise, and accurate understanding of the details of the revolution of sentiments within Westchester-county, as portions of that more extended revolution, throughout the Colony and the Continent, "in the "minds and hearts of the people,"[2] it is believed, will therefrom, be more readily and more certainly, if not more permanently, assured to the greater number of readers who shall resort to these pages.

Without the slightest indication of any concern because of the humiliating defeat to which it had been subjected, in the abandonment of one of the principal of its peculiar and emphatically declared principles, and in the acceptance, in the place of that abandoned principle, by its own nominees, of one of the peculiarly antagonistic principles of those whom it had persistently endeavored to silence and suppress, on the day after the election of the Delegates to the proposed Congress, [*July* 29,] the Committee of Correspondence in New York addressed a second Circular Letter to the County Committee, where there was one, or to the Treasurer, where there was no Com-

[1] *Letter of the Committee of Correspondence of New York to the Committee in Charleston*, "NEW YORK, July 26th, 1774," Postscript, dated "July "28th;" *the same to the Committee in Philadelphia*, "NEW YORK, July 28th, "1774;" *the same to Matthew Tilghman, Chairman of the Maryland Committee*, "NEW YORK, July 28th, 1774;" *Lieutenant-governor Colden to the Earl of Dartmouth*, "NEW YORK 2 August 1774;" *the same to Governor Tryon*, "SPRING HILL 2 August 1774;" *the same to the Earl of Dartmouth*, "NEW YORK 7th Septr 1774;" *the same to Governor Tryon*, "Septr 7th "1774;" Jones's *History of New York during the Revolutionary War*, i., 31, 35; Bancroft's *History of the United States*, original edition, vii., 83; *the same*, centenary edition, iv., 358.

[2] "An History of Military Operations, from April 19, 1775, to September 3, 1783, is not an History of the American Revolution, any more "than the Marquis of Quincy's *Military History of Louis XIV*, though "much esteemed, is a History of the Reign of that Monarch. The "Revolution was in the minds and hearts of the people, and in the "Union of the Colonies, both of which were substantially effected before "hostilities commenced."—*Letter from John Adams to Judidiah Morse*, "QUINCY, Nov. ber 29, 1815."

mittee, in each of the several Counties in the Colony, in which, after it had stated the election of Delegates to represent the City of New York, in the proposed Congress, to be assembled on the first of September ensuing, at Philadelphia, it presumptuously and with an assumed air of leadership, continued, in these words: "It therefore becomes necessary that the "Delegates to represent the other Counties in this "Province be speedily appointed. The Counties will "judge of the propriety of confiding in the same per-"sons only which we have chosen, or to appoint such "others to go, with them, to the Congress, as they "may think fit to depute, for that purpose. Permit "us to observe that the number of Delegates is imma-"terial, since those of each Province, whether more "or less, will conjointly have only one vote at the "Congress. In order, however, that the representa-"tion of the different Counties may be quite com-"plete, it is absolutely necessary that your County "appoint, with all possible speed, one or more Dele-"gates to join and go with ours to the Congress, or, if "you choose to repose your confidence in our Dele-"gates, that you signify such your determination, in "the most clear and explicit terms, by the first op-"portunity, after the sense of your County can be "known, on so interesting a subject." [1]

To this Circular Letter which was thus sent to the several rural Counties throughout the Colony, only six of those Counties are known to have paid the slightest attention, those of Westchester, Duchess, and Albany having respectively authorized the Delegates whom the City of New York had elected, to represent them, also, in the Congress; [2] while those of Kings, [3] Suffolk, [4] and Orange, [5] respectively, sent Delegates of their own appointment; and Richmond, Queens, Ulster, Cumberland, Gloucester, Charlotte, and Tryon, respectively, did not manifest the slightest interest in the subject. [6] For the purposes of this work, only the action of the County of Westchester, on that Circular Letter, can be noticed in this place.

As the Committee of Correspondence evidently intended that only the united action of the entire County, in every instance, should be invited, on the subject of appointing Delegates to the proposed Congress, it is not probable that the sentiments of the individual Towns, on any other subjects, were considered desirable, or were expected to be ascertained, or, if ascertained, were desired to be given to the public. Be that as it may, for some reason, if more than four Towns in Westchester-county took any action whatever, in response to the Circular Letter of the Committee, concerning the political questions of that period, or for the appointment of Deputies to represent the County in the proposed Congress, or for any other purpose, the record of that action has escaped the notice of working historical students—the proceedings of Mamaroneck were communicated directly to the Committee, at New York, in a letter dated on the seventh of August; and those of Bedford were also communicated, directly to the same Committee, in a letter dated on the ninth of that month: [7] the proceedings of Rye and those of the Borough Town of Westchester, because of the respective opinions of those Towns, on other subjects, which were more fully and formally expressed, require more particular notice.

On the tenth of August, responsive to the Circular Letter from the Committee in New York, the Freeholders and Inhabitants of Rye, who sympathized with that Committee in its proposal that Westchester-county should appoint Delegates to represent it in the proposed Congress, met and appointed John Thomas, Junior, Esq., James Horton, Junior, Esq., Robert Bloomer, Zeno Carpenter, and Ebenezer Haviland, for "a Committee to consult and determine, with the "Committees of the other Towns and Districts within "the County," in County Convention, to be assembled at the Court-house, at the White Plains, on Monday, the twenty-second of August, "upon the ex-"pediency of sending one or more Delegates to the "Congress, to be held in Philadelphia, on the first "day of September next."

The Meeting appears to have patiently waited, without adjourning, while the Committee which it had appointed, organized, by the appointment of Ebenezer Haviland, as its Chairman; and considered the great political questions of the day; and expressed its conclusions on those questions, in a series of Resolutions, in the following words:

"THIS MEETING being greatly alarmed at the late "Proceedings of the British Parliament, in order to "raise a Revenue in America; and considering their late "most cruel, unjust, and unwarrantable Act for block-"ing up the Port of Boston, having a direct tendency to "deprive a free People of their most valuable Rights "and Privileges, an introduction to subjugate the In-"habitants of the English Colonies and to render "them Vassals to the British House of Commons:

"RESOLVE, FIRST, That they think it their greatest "Happiness to live under the illustrious House of "Hanover; and that they will steadfastly and uni-"formly bear true and faithful Allegiance to His

[1] *Draft of the Circular Letter sent to the Committee or Treasurer of the different Counties*, "NEW YORK, July 29, 1774," appended to the *Minutes of the Committee*, "NEW YORK, July 28, 1774."

See, also, *Lieutenant-governor Colden to Governor Tryon*, "SPRING "HILL 2 August 1774."

[2] *Credentials of those Delegates—Journal of the Congress*, "Monday, "September 5, 1774."

[3] *Credential of Simon Boerum—Journal of the Congress*, "Saturday, "October 1, 1774."

[4] *Credential of William Floyd—Journal of the Congress*, "Monday, "September 5, 1774."

[5] *Credential of Henry Wisner—Journal of the Congress*, "Wednesday, "September 14, 1774, A.M." and that of *John Herring—Journal of the "Congress*, "Monday, September 26, 1774, A.M."

[6] *Lieutenant-governor Colden to the Earl of Dartmouth*, "NEW YORK, "7th September, 1774."

[7] *Minutes of the Committee*, "NEW YORK, August 29, 1774."

"Majesty, King George the Third, under the enjoy-"ment of their constitutional Rights and Privileges, "as fellow-subjects, with those of England.

"SECOND, That we conceive it a fundamental part "of the British Constitution, that no Man shall be "taxed but by his own Consent, or that of his Repre-"sentative, in Parliament; and as we are by no means "represented, we consider all Acts of Parliament "imposing Taxes on the Colonies, an undue ex-"ertion of Power, and subversive of one of the most "valuable Privileges of the English Constitution.

"THIRD, That it is the Opinion of this Meeting "that the Act of Parliament for shutting up the Port "of Boston, and divesting some of the Inhabitants of "private Property, is a most unparalleled, rigorous, "and unjust piece of Cruelty and Despotism.

"FOURTH, That unanimity and firmness of "Measures in the Colonies are the most effectual "Means to secure the invaded Rights and Privileges "of America, and to avoid the impending Ruin which "now threatens this once happy Country.

"FIFTH, That the most effectual mode of redress-"ing our Grievances will be by a general Congress of "Delegates from the different Colonies; and that we "are willing to abide by such Measures as they, in "their Wisdom, shall think most conducive upon "such an important Occasion."

These Resolutions were duly submitted to the Meeting; and, as the official record says, they "were "unanimously approved of;" when the assemblage quietly dispersed.[1]

Those who are acquainted with the questionable practices of ambitious, and, not unfrequently, unscrupulous politicians, will be prepared, without warning, for the reception of any modification of the recorded features of that Meeting, at Rye, of which mention has been made—the first demonstration, in Westchester-county, concerning the great political questions of the day, of which there is, now, any existing record.

It does not appear, nor is it pretended, that the Meeting of "the Freeholders and Inhabitants of the "Township of Rye," now under consideration, was numerously attended; and, as it was held during the busiest season of the agricultural year, there is no reason for supposing that many were present. In the same connection, it will be seen that the place of meeting is, also, unnoticed on the record. The master-spirit of the assembled farmers, whether many or few in number, was John Thomas, Junior, one of a family of officeholders under the Home and the Colonial Governments,[2] and, himself, an anxious office-seeker, from the revolutionary party;[3] and the well-considered and well-worded Resolutions, as well-adapted for the protection of the father's official positions as for the construction of others for the son's advancement, and evidently the work of a master-hand which was not seen in the Committee nor in the Meeting, promote a suspicion that that Meeting of "the Free-"holders and Inhabitants of the Township of Rye," the first indication of Westchester-county's inclination to enter the area of political strife, was nothing more nor less than a movement in the Thomas family, and for its particular benefit. Subsequent events, in connection with the doings of those who were present, at that particular Meeting, serve to strengthen that suspicion, if not to confirm it.[4]

While the politicians, in Rye, were discussing, with more or less satisfaction, the result of their doings, to which reference has been made, those in the Bor-

[1] Official report of the proceedings of the Meeting—Holt's *New-York Journal*, No. 1650, NEW-YORK, Thursday, August 18, 1774.

See, also, Gaine's *New-York Gazette, and the Weekly Mercury*, No. 1192, NEW-YORK, Monday, August 15, 1774, and *Rivington's New-York Gazetteer*, No. 70, NEW-YORK, Thursday, August 18, 1774.

[2] The Grandfather of John Thomas, Junior, was the Rev. John Thomas, Rector of St. George's Church, Hempstead, Long Island, who, from his Ordination, in 1704, until his death, in 1727, was a Missionary in the employ of the Society for Propagating the Gospel in Foreign Parts, in London. The father of John Thomas, Junior, was Hon. John Thomas, who, from 1743 until the dissolution of the Colonial Government, in 1776, was a Member of the General Assembly of the Colony, representing the County of Westchester; and, from May, 1755, until the dissolution of the Colonial Government, in 1776, he was the First Judge of the Colonial Court of Common Pleas for the County of Westchester—both of which offices could have been held by no one who was not well-disposed to the Colonial and Home Governments; and neither of which was surrendered by him, while he lived.

The following extract from a letter from Timothy Wetmore, the Venerable Society's Schoolmaster at Rye, to the Secretary of that body, at London, dated "RYE, May 6, 1761," affords additional evidence of the political tendencies of the Thomas family, and of its hankerings after the power to manipulate the "patronage" of those in authority, throughout Westchester-county: "Mr. Thomas, who is one of the Representa-"tives in this County, and who, in Governour De Lancey's time, being "favoured with all the Administration of all Offices in the Country, civil "and military, by the help of which he has procured himself a large in-"terest in the County, especially in the distant and new Settlements, "which abound with a Set of People governed more by venality than "any thing else. This Gentleman, although one of the Society's "Missionaries' Sons, is so negligent and indifferent toward Religion "(in imitation of some of our great Men) that it has been a steady "Method with him, for years, not to attend Publick Worship, perhaps "more than once or twice in a year, whose example has been mis-"chievous. This man is not only one of our Vestry (though very "little esteemed by the true friends of the Church), but has procured "that the Majority of the Vestry are Men that will be governed by "him; several of the Vestry are not of the Church; and not one of "them a communicant in the Church; accordingly, the Church are "not at all consulted with regard to a successor," to the former Rector, who had died in the preceding May.

With the father, on the Bench, and in the Legislature, and in the interest of the Crown, and the son in the front rank, if not the actual head, of the revolutionary element, what there was of it, within the County, it mattered very little to the Thomas family, which of the two, the Crown or the Colonists, should become the victors.

[3] John Thomas, Junior, by this early movement in behalf of the revolutionary element, placed himself in the front rank of successful politicians in Westchester-county—he was a member of the Committee of the County, and its Chairman; a Member of the Provincial Convention, representing Westchester-county, in 1775; a Member of the First and Second Provincial Congresses, representing Westchester-county, in 1775, 1776; Quartermaster of the Second Westchester-county Regiment, of which his brother, Thomas, was Colonel; and Sheriff of Westchester-county, from 1778 to 1781—his brothers, also, having been well provided for, in the public service.

[4] See the *Disclaimer of Isaac Gidney and eighty-three other "Freeholders "and Inhabitants of Rye,"* "RYE, New York, September 24, 1774," pages 32, 33, post.

ough Town of Westchester, within which the political family of Morris was seated,[1] prepared to follow their example. For that purpose, on Saturday, the twentieth of August, also in response to the Circular Letter received from the Committee of Correspondence in the City of New York, those of "the Freeholders "and Inhabitants" of that Borough Town who sympathized with that Committee in its request that Westchester-county should appoint Delegates to represent it in the proposed Congress, met, and appointed James Ferris, Esq., Colonel Lewis Morris, and Captain Thomas Hunt, "a Committee to meet the Com-"mittees of the different Towns and Precincts, within "this County, at the White Plains, on Monday, the "twenty-second instant, to consult on the expediency "of appointing one or more Delegates to represent "this County, at the general Congress, to be held at "Philadelphia, the first day of September next."

Like the similar Meeting, at Rye, this Meeting also waited, apparently without adjourning, until its Committee was formally organized, by the appointment of James Ferris, Esq., as its Chairman, and while that Committee considered the various political questions of the period—"the very alarming Situa-"tion of their suffering Brethren, at Boston, occa-"sioned by the late unconstitutional, arbitrary, and "oppressive Act of the British Parliament, for "blocking up their Port, as well as the several Acts "imposing Taxes on the Colonies, in order to raise a "Revenue in America"—and had prepared the following Resolutions expressive of the result of its deliberations on those very grave questions:

"First, *Resolved*, That we do and will bear true "Allegiance to His Majesty, George the Third, King "of Great Britain, &c., according to the British "Constitution.

"Second, That we coincide in opinion with our "friends of New York and of every other Colony, "that all Acts of the British Parliament, imposing "Taxes on the Colonies, without their Consent, or by "their Representative, are arbitrary and oppressive, "and should meet the abhorrence and detesta-"tion of all good men; That they are replete with "the purpose of creating Animosities and Dissensions "between the Mother Country and the Colonies; "and thereby tend to destroy that Harmony and "mutual Agreement which it is so much the Interest "of both, to Cherish and Maintain.

"Third, That we esteem it our Duty, and think it "incumbent on all the Colonies in America, to con-"tribute towards the Relief of the poor and distressed "People of Boston; and that a Person of this Bor-"ough be appointed to collect such charitable Dona-"tions, within the same, as may be offered for their "Support.

"Fourth, That as a Division in the Colonies "would be a sure means to counteract the present "Intention of the Americans, in their Endeavours to "preserve their Rights and Liberties from the Inva-"sion that is threatened, we do most heartily recom-"mend a Steadiness and Unanimity in their Meas-"ures, as they will have the happy Effects of averting "the Calamity that the late tyrannical Acts of the "British Parliament would otherwise most assuredly "involve us in.

"Fifth, That to obtain a Redress of our Griev-"ances, it has been thought most advisable, in the "Colonies, to appoint a general Congress, we will take "Shelter under the Wisdom of those Gentlemen who "may be chosen to represent us, and cheerfully ac-"quiesce in any Measures they may judge shall be "proper, on this very alarming and critical Occasion."

These Resolutions were duly presented to the Meeting; and the official record of the proceedings of that Meeting tells, to all comers, they "were unani-"mously agreed to;" after which the Meeting was dissolved.[2]

Because the numerous tenants and other dependents on the Morris family were residents of Westchester, and not distant, there is reason for the supposition that the Meeting was well-attended; and there can be no reasonable doubt that the proceedings were conducted with entire propriety and good order. But, like the Meeting at Rye, of which mention has been made, that at Westchester was evidently controlled by a single master-spirit; and, like the former, the latter was, also, unquestionably convened and conducted, not as much for the clear expression of the uncontrolled and intelligent opinions of "the Free-"holders and Inhabitants" of the Town, on the grave questions which were submitted to them, or for the honest promotion of the best interests of the Colony, as for a preparation of the way for the return of the Morris family to place, and authority, and influence in the political affairs of the Colony, from which, through the controlling power of the De Lanceys, it had been, for many years, entirely excluded.

It is probable that the other Towns throughout the County, if any such Towns, really or apparently, responded to the invitation of the Committee of Correspondence in New York, either contented themselves, like those of Bedford and Mamaroneck, with only the elections of Delegates to the proposed Convention of the County, without any further expression of their sentiments, or, if they expressed such sentiments or any others, that, in the absence of all other than merely local agitators, they did not crowd those sentiments before a people who were already surcharged with such wordy manifestations; and it remains only for us to record the additional

[1] Until 1846, the Borough Town of Westchester included, within its boundaries, the more modern towns of Westchester, West Farms, and Morrisania.

[2] Official record of the proceedings of the Meeting, in Gaine's *New-York Gazette: and the Weekly Mercury*, No. 1194, New-York, Monday, August 29, 1774, and in *Rivington's New-York Gazetteer*, No. 72, New-York, Thursday, September 2, 1774.

facts that, on Monday, the twenty-second of August, 1774, a Convention of Delegates from the several Towns and Districts of Westchester-county, or from a number of them, was assembled in the Court-house, at the White Plains; that Colonel Frederic Philipse, Lord of the Manor of Philipseborough and a Member of the General Assembly of the Province, representing the County of Westchester in that body, was in the Chair of that Convention;[1] that it was determined to authorize a Delegation to represent the County, in the proposed Congress of the Continent, at Philadelphia; and that Isaac Low, Philip Livingston, James Duane, John Alsop, and John Jay, who had been elected to represent the City and County of New York, in that Congress, should be duly authorized, also, to represent the County of Westchester, therein.[2]

By that determination and action of its nominally authorized Convention, the County of Westchester, in history, if not in fact,[3] placed itself abreast of the most advanced advocates for the autonomy of the British Colonies in America; and no one can successfully dispute the fact that the Delegates whom, the records say, the County authorized to represent it, in the consultations and discussions and votes of the proposed Congress, no matter what, in the Congress or elsewhere, the doings of those who composed that Delegation may have been, were gentlemen of the highest social standing; that some of them were gentlemen of the highest intellectual powers; and that all possessed what, at that time, either consistently or inconsistently, honestly or dishonestly, they publicly assumed to have been the highest regard for the welfare of the Colony and of the Continent. It appears, however, notwithstanding that apparently general movement, in favor of the proposed Congress, among the farmers of Westchester-county, or, at least, a general acquiescence therein, that there was a very important portion of them, individually respectable and respectable in numbers, who had not been thus influenced; who, therefore, had not joined in the reported election of Delegates to the Convention; and who were without any sympathy with those who were promoting the call for a Congress of the Continent, even for consultation and mutual advice. There is reason, also, for supposing that there were many such cautious or timid conservatives, in each of the Towns, if, indeed, the great body of the inhabitants of each was not thus disposed to maintain the conservatism of the past; that they were not confined to any particular class of the inhabitants of those Towns; and that they included holders of freehold properties and of the right of suffrage at the Polls as well as holders of leasehold properties, Tenants on the Manors, who held no such political right—all of them men of intelligence and respectability. A specimen of the dissent referred to, may be seen in the following disclaimer, which was published in the newspapers of the day:[4]

"RYE, NEW YORK; September 24, 1774.

"We, the Subscribers, Freeholders and Inhabitants "of the Town of Rye, in the County of Westchester, "being much concerned with the unhappy Situation "of public Affairs, think it our Duty to our King and "Country, to Declare that we have not been con-"cerned in any Resolutions entered into or Measures "taken, with regard to the Disputes at present sub-"sisting with the Mother Country; we also testify "our dislike to many hot and furious Proceedings, in "consequence of said Disputes, which we think are "more likely to ruin this once happy Country, than "remove Grievances, if any there are.

"We also declare our great Desire and full Reso-"lution to live and die peaceable Subjects to our "Gracious Sovereign, King George the Third, and his "Laws.

"Isaac Gidney,	William Armstrong,
"Abraham Wetmore,	James Hains,
"John Collum,	Thomas Thaell,
"Henry Bird,	Dennis Lary,

[1] "*Card to the Public*," reprinted in Force's *American Archives*, Fourth Series, i., 1188, 1189.

[2] *Credentials of the Delegates from New-York, Journal of the Congress*, "Monday, September 5, 1774."

[3] The subsequently published disclaimer of inhabitants of Rye and other circumstances of the same tendency, inclines us to the belief of what Lieutenant-governor Colden informed the Earl of Dartmouth, on that general subject, in his Despatch of October 5, 1774, that "a great deal of "Pains has been taken to perswade the Counties to chuse Delegates for "the Congress or to adopt those sent by this City. Several of the Coun-"ties have refused to be concerned in the Measures. In Queens-County "where I have a House & reside the summer Season six Persons have not "been got together for the Purpose and the Inhabitants remain firm in "their Resolution not to join in the Congress. In the Counties that have "joined in the Measures of the City, I am informed the Business has "been done by a very few Persons who took upon themselves to act for "the Freeholders. A Gentleman who was present when the Delegates "were chosen in Orange County says, there were not twenty Persons "present at that Meeting tho' there are above 1000 Freeholders in that "County: and I am told the case was similar in other Counties that it "is said have joined in the Congress."

In the same connection, Joseph Galloway, when he was examined before the House of Commons, testified, that "I don't think that one-fifth "part have, from principle and choice, supported the present Rebellion." * * * "The last Delegation to Congress, made by the Province of "Pennsylvania, and the appointment of all the Officers of that State, was "made by less than two hundred Voters, although there are at least "thirty thousand men intitled to Vote, by the Laws of the Province. "One instance more I beg leave to give. One of the Delegates from the "Province of New York, (with whom I sat in Congress in 1774) repre-"senting a considerable District in that Province, was chosen by himself "and his clerk only, and that clerk certified to the Congress that he was "unanimously appointed!" In a foot-note to this portion of that testimony, Galloway added: "The people of Kings County so much disap-"proved of the sending any Members to the Congress, that, although "due notice was given of the time and place of Election, only two of "them met: Mr. Simon Boerum appointed his friend Clerk, and the "Clerk appointed Mr. Boerum a Delegate in Congress, who was the only "Representative for that large County."—(*Examination*, 16 *June*, 1779—*The Examination of Joseph Galloway, Esq., before the House of Commons*, London: 1779, 10, 11.)

See, also, Galloway's *Letters to a Nobleman*, Second Edition, London: 1779, 21.

[4] *Rivington's New-York Gazetteer*, No. 78, NEW-YORK, Thursday, October 13, 1774.

"Robert Merrit,	Roger Purdy,
"Roger Merrit,	Gilbert Brundige,
"Isaac Anderson,	Joseph Clark,
"John Willis,	James Gedney,
"Nehemiah Sherwood,	James Purdy,
"William Crooker,	John Adee,
"Andrew Carhart,	Nathaniel Purdy,
"Seth Purdy,	Joseph Wilson,
"Disbury Park,	Benjamin Willson,
"Major James Horton,	James Hart,
"Nathaniel Sniffen,	Silemon Halsted,
"Sol. Gidney,	James Budd,
"Bartholomew Hains,	Thomas Kniffen,
"Gilbert Hains,	Gilbert Merrit, Esq.
"Joshua Purdy,	John Carhart,
"James Wetmore,	Israel Seaman,
"William Brown,	William Hall,
"Joseph Purdy,	Capt. Abraham Bush,
"Jonathan Budd,	Andrew Lion,
"Ebenezer Brown, Jun.,	James Jamisson,
"Henry Slater,	Thomas Brown,
"Andrew Kniffen,	Gilbert Thaell, Jun.,
"Thomas Wilson,	Joseph Merrit, Jun.,
"Timothy Wetmore, Esq.,	Jonathan Gedney,
"Daniel Erwin,	John Guion,
"Roger Park,	Elijah Hains,
"Roger Kniffen,	John Affrey,
"John Hawkins,	Hack. Purdy,
"Andrew Merrit,	Charles Thaell, Esq.,
"Archibald Tilford,	John Kniffen,
"Adam Seaman,	John Park,
"Rievers Morrel,	Joshua Gedney,
"Abraham Miller,	Ebenezer Brown,
"Jonathan Kniffen,	John Slater,
"John Buvelot,	Benjamin Kniffen,
"Gilbert Thaell,	Nehemiah Wilson,
"Isaac Brown,	Gilbert Morris, Jr.,
"Peter Florence."	

Those who are acquainted with the methods which are very often employed by audacious partisans or by those more insidious supporters of a questionable proposition, for the instruction of an opponent in what way to do or to say what, if left to himself, he would not think of either saying or doing, in any manner, will be very likely to concur in the suspicion which prevails, that the following papers, each of them supplementary to the above-recited disclaimer and declaration, were the reasonable results of such, not always gentle, social or political or ecclesiastical or financial pressure as is, very generally, seen among the methods to which reference has been made.

"RYE, October 17th, 1774.

"We, the Subscribers, having been suddenly and "unwarily drawn in, to sign a certain Paper pub-"lished in Mr. Rivington's *Gazetteer*, of the 13th "instant; and being now, after mature deliberation, "fully convinced that we acted preposterously, and "without adverting properly to the Matter in dispute "between the Mother Country and her Colonies, are, "therefore, sorry that we ever had any concern in "said Paper; and we do by these Presents utterly "disclaim every part thereof, except our expressions "of Loyalty to the King and Obedience to the con-"stitutional Laws of the Realm.

"Abraham Miller,	William Brown,
"Adam Seaman,	Isaac Anderson,
"Andrew Carehart,	William Crooker,
"John Carehart,	Andrew Lyon,
"Gilbert Brundige,	John Buflot,
"John Willis,	John Slater,
"James Jameson,	Israel Seaman,
"Gilbert Merrit." [1]	

The following very cautiously worded Card, appended to a full copy of the disclaimer and declaration, dated on the twenty-fourth of September, which bore the signature of Timothy Wetmore, Esquire, was published, forty days afterwards:

"The above Paper, like many others, being liable "to misconstruction, and having been understood, by "many, to import a Recognition of a Right in the "Parliament of Great Britain, to bind America, in all "cases whatsoever, and to signify that the Colonies "labour under no Grievances, which is not the Sense "I meant to convey, I think it my Duty to explain "my Sentiments upon the Subject, and thereby pre-"vent future Mistakes

"It is my Opinion that the Parliament have no "Right to Tax America, tho' they have a Right to "regulate the Trade of the Empire. I am further of "Opinion that several Acts of Parliament are Griev-"ances; and that the execution of them ought to be "Opposed, in such Manner as may be Consistent with "the Duty of a Subject to our Sovereign; tho' I can-"not help expressing my Disapprobation of many "violent Proceedings, in some of the Colonies.

"Dated the 3d of November, 1774.

"TIMOTHY WETMORE." [2]

The organization of the Congress of the Continent, and its Proceedings, as far as it permitted those Proceedings to be made public, and the series of papers which it sent forth, in behalf of the complaining Colonies, form important portions of the world's history which need not be repeated, in this place. It will not be improper, however, to notice, in this connection, the fact that two, if no more, of the Delegates who represented the revolutionary portion of the inhabitants of Westchester-county, in that Congress, were actively associated with Joseph Galloway, whom history has regarded as a "volunteer spy for the "British Government," [3] in a measure, proposed in the

[1] *Rivington's New-York Gazetteer*, No. 79, New-York, Thursday, October 20, 1774.

[2] *Rivington's New-York Gazetteer*, No. 82, NEW-YORK, Thursday, November 10, 1774.

[3] Bancroft's *History of the United States*, original edition, vii., 126; *the same*, centenary edition, iv., 392.

interest of the Crown, which the Congress not only rejected, with contempt, but would not permit to be laid on its table nor to be recorded on its published Journal;[1] that one of those two Delegates was subsequently discovered to have been quite as deeply implicated in a perfidious communication of the secret proceedings of the Congress, with quite as earnest a sympathy for the King and the Government, as Joseph Galloway is known to have been;[2] and that the other Delegate referred to signalized himself, throughout the entire period occupied by the Congress, not only by his earnest advocacy of "the insidious proposi-"tion" of Joseph Galloway, offered and supported in the interest of the Crown, but by his unceasing opposition to every assertion of republican principles and by his equally untiring support of whatever sustained the existing power of the aristocracy and the time-hallowed prerogatives of the Crown and the Parliament[3]—he has not, indeed, been found to have been, directly, in the service of the Colonial Government; but he is known to have been the willing associate and confidential friend of those who were actively employed in that service; and in their loyal labors, in behalf of their recognized Sovereign, he is known, also, to have been their open and untiring and most distinguished co-worker,[4] concealed from the light of open day, however, by the vote of secrecy which his friends and associates did not hesitate to disregard, in the presence of the official representative of the Crown, who was, also, their political master. It has been usual to screen the latter of the two Delegates from the censures of history and to regard him as peculiarly pure and virtuous, as a man and as a politician; but, as has been well-said by another, "there "are no tricks in plain and simple faith."

It will not be improper to notice, also, in this connection, that the proceedings and the recommendations of the Congress were not, by any means, unanimously accepted and approved, either by the several Colonial Assemblies, or by the several Towns throughout the Colonies, or by the Inhabitants of the Towns, individually; and that, in many instances, that dissent was made known to the world, in terms which could not be mistaken. Indeed, no intelligent person can arise from a careful and dispassionate examination of the unquestionable authorities which have come down to us, concerning the origin of that Congress, the expressed purposes for which it was called, its organization, the extent of authority which was delegated to the several Delegations of which it was composed, and the action of those Delegations, within the Congress, without having been entirely convinced that the Congress was not a legally constituted body, created in pursuance of Law, and entitled to recognition, in law or in fact, by any individual Colonist or by any legally organized body, of any class;[5] that, on the contrary, it was nothing else than a voluntary association, in which, every member acted entirely on his individual responsibility, without possessing or acquiring the slightest right, in law, to exact obedience from any, beyond what each, for himself, had already specifically consented to yield; that it was proposed and organized only for consultation and advice and united action, within the well-defined limits of the Law of the Land; that no authority was vested in it, by its several constituencies, to assume and exercise any legislative functions whatever, to publish decrees equivalent to Statutes, to require obedience to such decrees, nor to order the infliction of penalties where there should be any disobedience to its enactments; that, to the extent of its action beyond the letter of the authority which had been delegated to it and as far as that action was in violation of existing Statutes, it acted in open violation of the clearly expressed loyalty of its several constituencies, of its own ostentatious pretensions of fealty to the Sovereign, and of that obedience to the fundamental Laws of the Kingdom, an alleged violation of which fundamental Laws, by the Parliament and the Ministry, constituted the gravamen of its denunciations of the Government, and the spirit of its own existence; that, to that extent, also, it was revolutionary; and, to that extent, therefore, it gave reasonable cause for discontent, and dis-

[1] "With a heart full of loyalty to my Sovereign, I went into Congress—"and from that loyalty I never deviated, in the least. I proposed a *Plan* "*of Accommodation* in the Congress, agreeable to my *Instructions*;—some "of the best men, and men of the best fortunes, espoused the *Plan*, and "drew with me."—(*Examination of Joseph Galloway before the House of Commons*, 18 *June*, 1779, London: 1779, 47-54.)

"His scheme" framed "in secret concert with the Governor of New "Jersey and with Colden of New York," "held out a hope of Continental "Union, which was the long cherished policy of New York; it was sec-"onded by Duane and advocated by Jay, but opposed by Lee of Vir-"ginia."—(Bancroft's *History of the United States*, original edition, vii., 149, 141; *the same*, centenary edition, iv., 402.)

"The scheme was intended to perpetuate the dependence of the Colo-"nies on England; and was proposed with the approbation of the loy-"alist Governors, Franklin of New Jersey, and Colden of New York. "Galloway urged it in an elaborate speech; and it was supported by "Duane, Jay, and Edward Rutledge. It was not only rejected, however, "but the members came at last to view it with so much odium that the "Motions in relation to it were ordered to be expunged from the *Jour-"nals*. This result was an end to the loyalist influence in Congress."—(Frothingham's *Rise of the Republic*, Boston: 1872, 367, 368.)

See, also, Hildreth's *History of the United States*, First Series iii., 16; Pitkin's *History of the United States*, i., 299, 300; Jones's *History of New York during the Revolutionary War*, ii., 109; etc.

[2] Vide pages 26, 27, ante.

[3] John Jay opposed some of the extremely democratic utterances of Patrick Henry, very properly; but he opposed, also, the utterance of Roger Sherman, when that plain man "deduced allegiance from consent," as he continued to oppose that democratic dogma, throughout his entire life. The aristocratic Richard Henry Lee was in harmony with him; but the democratic element of the Congress was widely opposed to him, in all his fundamental propositions.

[4] Vide the extracts from Galloway's *Examination*, Bancroft's *History of the United States*, and Frothingham's *Rise of the Republic*, in Note 1, page 34, above.

[5] Although this is not likely to be disputed, by any one, it may be proper to state that it was not claimed to have been so, by those who promoted the call for it—"it is allowed by the most Intelligent among "them, that these assemblies of the People are illegal and may be danger-"ous, but they deny that they are unconstitutional when a national "grievance cannot otherwise be removed."—(*Lieutenant-governor Colden to the Earl of Dartmouth*, "NEW YORK 1st June, 1774.")

175819

sent, and alarm, among those who had not been promised such a result; among those who were not inclined to be crowded into insurrection, without their consent; and among those whose best interests and whose families' best interests rested on a continued peace throughout the Colonies and on a due attention to their own affairs.

The purposes of this work afford no warrant for a more extended narrative than we have given of the really varied designs of those, in other Colonies than in that of New York, who promoted the assembling of a Congress of the Colonies; nor of the intrigues of those who, some for one purpose and some for another, desired to become members of that body; nor of the objects for which it was specially invited and convened; nor of the influences which controlled it, after it was convened, and which transformed it from that instrument for securing a peaceful redress of those grievances of which the Colonists had complained, that Reconciliation with the Mother Country which was "most ardently desired by all good men," that Harmony and good Will between Great Britain and her Colonists which only a very few revolutionists, in some of the Colonies, did not anxiously hope for, and that general Peace which would have restored prosperity and happiness to both the Colonists and the inhabitants of Great Britain, for securing all of which and for no other purpose whatever it had been specifically invited and convened, into an instrument for the violation of the rights of individuals and of property, previously regarded as sacred, and for the promotion of Insurrection and of Revolution and of Rebellion, of War and of Devastation and of Ruin, and these for nothing else than for the advancement of individual and sectional interests, for none of which latter purposes was there more than a handful of reckless advocates, in any of the Colonies, and against which, with the exception of the handful of "fire-eaters" of that period, to whom we have referred, there was, in each of the Colonies, nothing else than a firm and undivided opposition, in which every sect and every faction and every party were sincerely united. All these must be left for elucidation by other hands, in other works; but we may be permitted to say, here, in brief, that, since what were regarded as grievances, of which complaints had been made and which were sought to be redressed, were peculiarly of a commercial or mercantile character, the disaffection of the Colonists, in New York, because of those alleged grievances, was confined to the commercial and mercantile centres, the two Cities of New York and Albany, without affecting or disturbing the peace of or, indeed, exciting any particular interest within, the rural Counties, within the Colony; that, in consequence, whatever means were resorted to, by those of the commercial and mercantile classes, within those business centres and among those who were or who supposed they were aggrieved, for the purpose of obtaining a redress of their alleged grievances—of which means the proposed Congress of the Colonies, honestly or dishonestly, was said to have been one—were sustained and advanced, within those business centres, with an almost entire unanimity among their inhabitants and with all the energy and determination which self-interest, largely developed, can arouse among active, ambitious, unscrupulous, and wealthy men; while, among the agriculturists and small country traders, none of whom had been or were, in the slightest degree, aggrieved by the Colonial policy of the Home Government,—among whom, therefore, there was no disaffection, because of that policy; and whose individual interests would be more advanced and better secured by continued quiet, throughout the Colony, than by unrest and political excitement—there was an entire and generally prevailing indifference to the well-told complaints of the commercial and mercantile classes, within the Cities, as well as to the means for obtaining a redress of their particular grievances, to which those metropolitan Merchants and Traders had resorted, of all of which, the complaints as well as the means employed, these hard-handed rustics, with few exceptions, know almost nothing, and in none of which, the grievances or the means employed for the redress of those grievances, did they possess even the slightest personal interest. Each of these two classes of Colonists, in New York, the commercial and mercantile classes, within the two Cities, and the agricultural and dependent classes, throughout the country—the former assuming to have been aggrieved by the Home Government and originating means for the redress of those alleged grievances, on the one hand; the latter wholly indifferent to the complaints of the metropolitan Merchants and Traders and to the various means resorted to, by them, in their efforts to effect a removal of those grievances, on the other hand—was sincere, in maintaining what it did maintain, since each was prompted and controlled by nothing else than by its own personal interests; and what was really "patriotism," the interests of the aggregate body of the Colonists regardless of the interests of any individual or class of those Colonists, in either of those classes, if they were patriotic on any other subject, had no part nor lot in this matter.

The Congress of the Colonies, as the reader will remember and as we have stated, was one of those means which were resorted to, by the aristocratic, anti-revolutionary commercial and mercantile classes, within the City of New York and by those Traders whose seat was at Albany, for the purpose, it was alleged, of securing a peaceful redress of what those Merchants and Traders were pleased to consider as grievances—in other words, for the removal of those restraints on that "illicit trade" in which they had been so long, so corruptly, and so successfully engaged, which the Home Government had recently interposed, with more than usual efficiency; and for the exoneration of that lawlessness and reckless destruction of property, by mobs who had been in-

spired and directed by controlling members of those commercial and mercantile classes for which property the local authorities had neglected or declined to compensate the owners—and, besides the indifference of the farmers, who constituted a vastly great majority of the adult males who were permanent residents of the Colony, which we have described, it encountered, from its inception, the earnest and active and unscrupulous handful of "fire-eaters," within the City of New York, because of the moderate temper in which it had been proposed; because of the disregard of the pretensions of the Town of Boston, with which they were in harmonious correspondence; and because the authors and promoters of the project of convening such a Congress had disregarded the aspirations of some of those "fire-eaters" for places in the Delegation who would be sent to that Congress, as representatives of the Colony of New York; and, reasonably enough, it encountered, also, the opposition, direct and decided, of that very small number who personally constituted the Colonial Government, and by some of those who occupied places of honor and emolument under its authority, and, most zealously of all these, by those hungry sycophants of authority —hangers on of that Colonial Government who never failed to "sneeze, whenever it took snuff"—the aggregate of whom was powerless in its legitimate opposition because of the smallness of its numbers.

Notwithstanding the direct opposition of the little clique of fire-eating revolutionists and that of the larger and more influential circle of the Colonial Government and its adherents—"friends of Govern-"ment," as they called themselves—and the chilly indifference of the great body of the farmers, constituting the vast majority of the inhabitants of the Colony, that Congress of the Colonies was convened under the auspices of those among whom it was originated; was turned from the pacific purposes for which it had been called, into others which were revolutionary in their character; and was dissolved, to take its place in the history of that very eventful period. The "fire-eating" few who had succeeded in effecting that radical change in its character and in securing from it an acquiescence in their revolutionary purposes, were, of course, well pleased with the results of the movement. The Colonial Government and its adherents were, of course, none the less antagonistic to it, because they were powerless to suppress the growing revolt or to protect the Colonists from the effects of the revolutionary action of the Congress. The farmers throughout the Colony continued their agricultural labors in continued indifference, unmindful of that approaching catastrophe which was, so very soon afterwards, to overwhelm themselves as well as others and to involve all, alike, in one common ruin of every thing which was or which could be dear to them. Of those commercial and mercantile classes among whom the Congress had originated and by whom it had been fostered, very many disapproved the violence of its declared policy—of that policy which had closed the doors to all hopes for Reconciliation and Peace, and which had opened the doors, invitingly, to Revolution and Rebellion, to War and Ruin—and drew back from those who continued to sustain the Congress and who, then, were preparing to enforce its decrees; while the latter portion of those classes, allied with the revolutionary faction whom those commercial and mercantile classes had previously declined to recognize and for whom, individually and collectively, only that superficial respect which practical politicians have always entertained for those, of lower ranks of society, whom they have sought to employ as the means of their own advancement to place and influence and wealth, was entertained, proceeded to enforce, by fair means or by foul, the various decrees, thinly disguised as "recommendations," which the Congress had enacted.

The memory of those readers whose hairs of gray reveal the advent or the presence of old age, will be very likely to compare all these circumstances with similar circumstances which have occurred, within our own country and within the period of their own personal recollections; and to the practical, personal knowledge of that hoary headed tribunal we may safely refer all these movements and counter-movements for the advancement or the obstruction of predetermined and unholy revolt, for its intelligent judgment. The glamour of success may have made all these transactions, before the Congress was convened and while it was in session and after its dissolution, appear to have been possessed of different characters from those which they really possessed; the diligence of personal descendants, whose best claim to distinction among men rests only on the apocryphal fame of their ancestors, actors in those events, may have transformed the pigmies and the political tricksters and those who were without honor or honesty or manliness, of that period, into great men and patriots and men of virtue, of integrity, and of personal uprightness; but, notwithstanding all these fictitious interpositions, the Truth remains, unchanged and unchangeable.

Among the conservative farmers of Westchester-county, generally, it is believed that the result of the Congress was not satisfactory—as will be seen, hereafter, some of the most influential of them, who had heartily approved the popular movement for the redress of the Colony's grievances, and who had earnestly united with their countrymen in calling the Congress, were forced to the seeming inconsistency of open dissent; and there was significance in that dissent, while such other communities as the Towns of Hollis, in New Hampshire;[1] Marshfield, in Massa-

[1] *Proceedings of the Town*, in legal Town-Meeting, November 7, 1774, reprinted in Force's *American Archives*, Fourth Series, i., 1229.

chusetts;[1] Ridgefield,[2] Newtown,[3] Stratfield, (now Bridgeport,)[4] Greenwich, Danbury and its vicinity,[5] Darien,[7] Norwalk,[8] Redding,[9] Stamford,[10] New Milford,[11] Morris,[12] Plymouth,[13] Salisbury,[14] etc., indeed the entire western portion of the Colony,[15] in Connecticut; Oyster Bay,[16] Jamaica,[17] Shawangunk,[18] all those in Richmond-county,[19] in New York, and many others,[20] some of them by formal Votes, in legal Town-meetings, and all of them, in practise, also declared their disapproval of the revolutionary measures adopted by the Congress and recommended by it, to be enforced in the several Colonies.

While the more conservative portions of the Colonists, in opposition to the Home Government, were earnestly laboring to maintain themselves in the leadership of the political elements of the Colony, and, at the same time, to secure a redress of the grievances to which the Colony had been subjected and to effect an honorable reconciliation between the Colonies and the Mother Country, the revolutionary portion of the same body of Colonists, strengthened by the accession to their number, of those, recently of the opposite portion, who were endeavoring to pose, for office-sake, both as aristocrats and as democrats, as might best suit successive audiences, nominally intent on the accomplishment of the same ends, was really employed in zealously promoting measures which were better adapted to the defeat of itself, in whatever it should really seek to accomplish, in the interests of peace.

On the seventh of November, James Duane, who had already distinguished himself, in connection with John Jay and Joseph Galloway, as everything else than an honest promoter of anything which was revolutionary in its tendencies, pandered to the revolutionary spirit which pervaded the revolutionary portion of the unfranchised inhabitants of the City, through whose influence he had once been elevated to a seat in the Congress and through whose continued influence, only, a similar favor might be secured, in the near future—that James Duane submitted a Resolution to the Committee of Correspondence, in the City of New York, for the election, by the Freeholders and the Freemen of the City, of eight persons in each Ward, for the purpose "of observing the conduct of all Persons touching the *Association*" [*of Non-Importation, and Non-Exportation, and Non-Consumption*] "entered into, by the Congress," against Great Britain and her Colonies, and for the purpose, also, of publishing the names of all those whom that Com-

---

[1] *Letter from Marshfield to a Gentleman in Boston*, January 24, 1775, published in *Rivington's New-York Gazetteer*, No. 95, NEW-YORK, Thursday, February 9, 1775, reprinted in Force's *American Archives*, Fourth Series, i., 1177, 1178; *Extract of a letter from Boston to a Gentleman in New-York*, January 26, 1775, reprinted in the same work, i., 1178; *Proceedings of the Town*, in legal Town-Meeting, 20th February, 1775, reprinted in the same work, i., 1249; *Protest of sixty four of the Inhabitants of the Town*, 20th February, 1775, reprinted in the same work, i., 1249, 1250.

[2] *Proceedings of the Town*, in Special Town-Meeting, 30th January, 1775, published in *Rivington's New-York Gazetteer*, No. 94, NEW-YORK, Thursday, February 2, 1775, and reprinted in Force's *American Archives*, Fourth Series, i., 1202, 1203; *Card signed by twenty-nine of the Inhabitants*, "RIDGEFIELD, Connecticut, February 2, 1775," reprinted in the same work, i., 1210; *Proceedings of Adjourned Town-Meeting*, April 10, 1775, reprinted in Hurd's *History of Fairfield-county, Connecticut*, 653; the same work, 650, 653; Teller's *History of Ridgefield, Conn.*, 45, 46.

[3] *Proceedings of the Town*, in Town-Meeting, "NEWTOWN, CONNECTICUT, February 6, 1775," published in *Rivington's New-York Gazetteer*, No. 97, NEW-YORK, Thursday, February 23, 1775, re-printed in Force's *American Archives*, Fourth Series, i., 1215; Hurd's *History of Fairfield-county*, 465.

[4] Hurd's *History of Fairfield-county*, 78, 79, and the *Petition for Harbor Guard*, dated January 14, 1777, which is therein reprinted.

[5] Hurd's *History of Fairfield-county*, 373, 371, and the *Charges made against Rev. Jonathan Murdock, Pastor of the West Society*, dated July 12, 1784, printed therein; Mead's *History of Greenwich*, 153, 154.

[6] *Proceedings of the Town*, in legal Town-Meeting, February 6, 1775, in *Rivington's New-York Gazetteer*, No. 97, NEW-YORK, Thursday, February 23, 1775, reprinted in Force's *American Archives*, Fourth Series, i., 1216; Hurd's *History of Fairfield-county*, 184.

[7] Hurd's *History of Fairfield-county*, 268.

[8] Hurd's *History of Fairfield-county*, 502-504; Childs's *Burning of Norwalk*, in Hurd's *History*, 513, 514.

[9] *Rivington's New-York Gazetteer*, No. 97, NEW-YORK, Thursday, February 23, 1775; Rev. Mr. Beach's *Reports to the Secretary of the Venerable Society*, 1765-1781; Hurd's *History of Fairfield-county*, 583.

[10] Huntington's *History of Stamford*, 205; Hurd's *History of Fairfield-county*, 796.

[11] *Protest of one hundred and twenty Freeholders and Inhabitants of the Town of New Milford*, February 27, 1775, reprinted in Force's *American Archives*, Fourth Series, i., 1270; *History of Litchfield-county, Connecticut*, Phila.: 1881, 451.

[12] Dwight's *Travels*, ii., 369.

[13] *History of Litchfield-county*, 495, 496.

[14] *History of Litchfield-county*, 530.

[15] Hinman's *Historical Collections of the part sustained by Connecticut, during the War of the Revolution*, 18, 84, 570.

[16] *Letter from Oyster-bay to James Rivington, from "A Spectator,"* describing a Meeting of ninety Freeholders of that Town, on the thirtieth of December, 1774. (*Rivington's New-York Gazetteer*, No. 90, NEW YORK, Thursday, January 5, 1775.)

[17] *Declaration of ninety-one Freeholders and forty-five other principal Inhabitants of Jamaica*, "JAMAICA, January 27, 1775," in *Rivington's New-York Gazetteer*, No. 94, NEW-YORK, Thursday, February 2, 1775.

[18] Card, dated "ULSTER-COUNTY, NEW YORK, February 11, 1775," published in Force's *American Archives*, Fourth Series, i., 1230.

[19] *Proceedings of the Committee of Observation of Elizabethtown, New Jersey*, February 13, 1775, published in Holt's *New-York Journal*, No. 1073, NEW-YORK, Thursday, February 16, 1775; and those of the Committee for Observation for the Township of Woodbridge, New Jersey, "WOODBRIDGE, February 20, 1775," published in Force's *American Archives*, Fourth Series, i., 1249, each providing for "boycotting" the Staten Islanders.

[20] *Lieutenant-governor Colden to the Earl of Dartmouth*, "NEW YORK, 22 Nov. 1774;" *the same to the same*, "NEW YORK, December 7, 1774;" *the same to Governor Tryon*, "NEW YORK, Dec. 7, 1774;" *Governor Gage to the same*, "BOSTON, December 15, 1774;" *Joseph Reed to Josiah Quincy, Junior*, "PHILADELPHIA, November 6, 1774;" *Proceedings of a Meeting of Freeholders of Middlesex-county, New Jersey*, "according to a "Notice," January 3, 1775, reprinted in Force's *American Archives*, Fourth Series, i., 1083; *Proceedings of Town of Barnstable, Massachusetts in Town-Meeting*, January 4, 1775, reprinted in the same work, i., 1092; *Letter from Georgia to a Gentleman in New York*, dated February 18, 1775; reprinted in the same, i., 1100; *Proceedings of the General Committee*, [establishing non-intercourse with Georgia] "CHARLESTOWN, "SOUTH CAROLINA, February 8, 1775;" *Dutchess-county* [New York] *Association*, January 18, 1775; *Letter to James Rivington*, dated "FLUSHING, IN QUEEN'S COUNTY, LONG-ISLAND, Jan. 14," published in *Rivington's New York Gazetteer*, No. 92, NEW-YORK, Thursday, January 19, 1775; *Letter to the same*, dated, "NEWTOWN ON LONG ISLAND, Jan. 12, "1775," published in the same issue of that paper; *Letter to the same from Ulster-county, New-York*, published in the same paper, No. 93, NEW-YORK, Thursday, January 26, 1775; *Letter to the same, from Dutchess-county*, published in the same paper, No. 95, NEW YORK, Thursday, February 9, 1775; etc.

mittee should condemn, for having violated that *Association*, in order "that, thenceforth, the parties to the "said *Association* should respectively break off all deal-"ings with him or her"—in more modern phraseology, in order that the alleged offender, whether guilty or innocent of any violation of law, on the mere condemnation of a local Committee, on whom individual animosity or local prejudice might exercise a greater power than either justice or equity could control, might be promptly boycotted, in all his or her business relations, and, thereby, be involved in disaster and ruin. At the same time, John Jay, Peter T. Curtenius, Isaac Low, and James Duane were appointed to prepare a Circular Letter to the different Counties, recommending them, also, to appoint similar "Com-"mittees of Inspection," "agreeably to the provisions "of the eleventh resolve of the Congress." [1]

"Some difficulties having arisen relative to the Ad-"vertisement published by the Committee, for choos-"ing a Committee of Inspection"—in other words, the handful of professional politicians who assumed to represent the unfranchised Mechanics and Working-men of the City, having repudiated the limitations imposed by the Congress, and insisted that the votes of the great body of the inhabitants, as well as those of the Freeholders and Freemen, of the City, should be received, in the election of the proposed Committee of Inspection—an interview, between the leaders of those plebeian and revolutionary claimants of political authority and their aristocratic and conservative neighbors of the Committee of Correspondence, was invited by the latter;[2] and, on the following day [*November* 15, 1774,] such an interview was had; but not until the Committee of Correspondence, meeting separately, had ordered "that, when "a Committee for carrying the *Association of the Con-"gress* into execution shall be elected, this Committee "do consider themselves as dissolved; and that this "Resolution be immediately made public."[3]

It was thus acknowledged by that Committee which had been originated in the memorable Caucus, at Sam. Francis's, six months previously, and which had been subsequently organized, with so much ostentation, at the Coffee-house, nominally, for the promotion of "the common cause" of the Colonies, in their reasonable dispute with the Home Government; but, more surely, for the protection of the conservative and aristocratic elements of the City's population from the already unwelcome and yet more threatened aggressions of those which were more democratic and revolutionary in their inclinations; and, less prominently, but most surely, for the advancement of the individual purposes of those who were its originators and master-spirits—by that hitherto respectable Committee of Fifty-one which no longer represented, without wavering, those political principles on which it had been originally founded and for which it had resolutely contended, not always unsuccessfully; which was no longer controlled by those who even appeared to be actuated simply by an unselfish de-

[1] *Minutes of the Committee of Correspondence*, "NEW-YORK, November 7, 1774."

The eleventh Resolution of the Congress, referred to in the text, provided "that a Committee be chosen in every County, City, and "Town, by those who are qualified to vote for Representatives in the "Legislature, whose business it shall be attentively to observe the con-"duct of all persons, touching this *Association*" [*of Non-Importation, Non-Consumption, and Non-Exportation*,]; "and when it shall be made "to appear to the satisfaction of a majority of any such Committee, that "any person within the limits of their appointment has violated "this *Association*" [*whether he may have consented to it, or not*] "that "such majority do forthwith cause the truth of the case to be published "in the *Gazette*, to the end that all such foes to the Rights of British "America may be publicly known and universally contemned, as the "enemies of American Liberty; and, thenceforth, we respectively will "break off all dealings, with him or her."

The reader will judge how ill-adapted such a "smelling Committee" as was thus ordered, in every Town, must have been, to promote harmony among the Colonists, or to give support to those who were seeking a redress of the grievances of the Colonies and a restoration of harmony between the Colonies and the Mother Country.

[2] *Minutes of the Committee of Correspondence*, "NEW YORK, November "14, 1774;" *Letter from the Committee of Correspondence to the Committee of Mechanics*, "COMMITTEE CHAMBER, November 14, 1774."

The uncertainties, if nothing else, of political office-seeking, and the tricks, if nothing else, of office-seekers, during that eventful period, may be seen, although they may not be entirely understood, in a comparison of the contemptuous manner in which the aristocratic Committee had spurned the democratic Committee, when it was proposed that the latter should be consulted, in the nomination of the ticket for Members of the proposed Congress, (*Minutes of the former*, June 29 and July 4, 1774,) with the eagerness with which the aristocratic nominees on that ticket, very soon afterwards, repudiated the fundamental principle maintained by their own organization, and accepted that of their plebeian neighbors' organization, in order to secure the support of that body, at the Polls, and to assure their election, (*Correspondence between Abraham Beasley and others, a Committee, and Philip Livingston and others, nominees for the office*, July 26 and 27, 1774); and with the voluntary invitation, from the aristocratic to the democratic Committee, to meet in conference, in the instance mentioned in the text, when the primary movement was to be made, toward the election of another Delegation, to meet in another Congress, in the ensuing May. If the reader will closely watch the successive events, in that connection, and notice the final result, he will see, also, how well the consolidation of aristocracy and democracy, into one mass of political conglomerate, for the advancement in authority of particular men, accomplished that purpose, the interests of the Colonies and those of political honesty, in the meanwhile, having been entirely disregarded.

[3] *Minutes of the Committee*, "NEW YORK, November 15, 1774."

Judge Jones, in his *History of New York during the Revolutionary War*, (i., 74,) said, "This Committee met frequently, and violent Resolutions "were proposed, but ever rejected. Mr. Low and the republicans of the "Committee finding it not to answer their purposes, actually dissolved "it, and nominated one of their own, without an election or the least "notice to the Citizens. Mr. Low continued Chairman. They acted as "a legal body, legally chosen, and fined, imprisoned, robbed, and ban-"ished His Majesty's loyal subjects with a vengeance." As will be seen, hereafter, the Judge was in error, when he supposed and stated that the second Committee, that of "Inspection," was not elected, and was created secretly, without notice to the Citizens. On the contrary, the two factions of the Opposition, in the City, having been consolidated in order to secure such a result, that "Committee of Inspection" was elected by "a respectable number of the Freeholders and Freemen "of this City, assembled at the City Hall, where the Election was con-"ducted under the inspection of several of the Vestrymen" of the City.

The unquestionable records of the doings of both Committees, as well as all known authorities brought down from that period and relating thereto, abundantly prove that there is nothing which was inaccurately stated, in any other portion of the statement, notwithstanding the learned Editor of the Judge's work, singularly enough, appears to entertain a different opinion on that subject.—(*Notes to the History*, i., 438.)

s re to promote the common weal; and which had been invaded, if it was not, then, controlled, by those, of the opposite and less comely faction of the party of the Opposition, with whom the majority of its members, by a formal vote, had already declined to affiliate—that its mission was completed, and that its original authority and power, through corrupt influences with which it was not unacquainted, had passed into other hands. It had, indeed, asserted and successfully maintained those conservative political principles, directly antagonistic to the more revolutionary political principles which the men of Boston had asserted and insisted on, which it believed to have been better adapted for the promotion of "the "common cause" and for that of the best interests of the Colonies; and, for the further promotion of "that "common cause," consciously or unconsciously, it had unselfishly prepared a way for the advancement of those, within itself, who coveted place and its prerogatives, by nominating them for seats in the Congress of which it had been the originator and the unyielding promoter. It had seen, however, the nominees of its selection, with one exception, barter that fundamental principle which it had especially cherished, for the votes, at the Polls, of those whom it had previously declined to recognize as parties in the struggle; it had subsequently seen those nominees, after their election, as members of the Delegation from New York, concur in the adoption of measures which it had already declined to approve and which were nothing if they were not aggressive and revolutionary; and, at last, it had seen the party of the Opposition crowded toward Rebellion, by the Congress of its own creation; and its own whilom master-spirits in conservative exclusiveness, anxious for a further advancement in place-holding and for the promotion of that particular purpose, joining hands with the principal supporters of what was, very clearly, only democratic and revolutionary. There was a fitness, therefore, that those of the Committee who had honestly and unselfishly opposed the aggressions of the Home Government, should cease to allow their names and whatever influence those names might possess, to be used by those who had betrayed the confidence which had been reposed in them, directly, for the advancement of their own personal ends, and, indirectly, for the promotion of Revolution, if not for that of Rebellion; and there was a peculiar fitness, also, that, whatever those conservative members of the Committee of Fifty-one should do or decline to do, in the interests of the Colonists and of the Colony, they should not remain, associated with, if not controlled by, those of the opposite faction of the confederated party of the Opposition, whose ultimate object, very clearly, was nothing else than the advancement to place and political authority of those who were its leaders, even if that advancement should be made at the cost of a Revolution and of a Civil War. The Committee of Correspondence did well, therefore, in thus providing for its own dissolution, without permitting itself to be crowded out of its existence by that faction of its own political party for whom it had, generally, no respect—by that faction of that party of the Opposition, hitherto its only political antagonist, which, then, appeared with John Jay and James Duane, lately two of the Committee, among its nominal leaders.

The result of the interview which the Committee of Correspondence had thus invited—one of the high contracting parties rapidly approaching its own dissolution, with only twenty-three of its fifty-one members present, and with eight of the twenty-three predestinated by their associates to an early retirement: the other of the two parties to the conference flushed with that most recent and most important of its victories over the aristocracy of the City—was a determination to nominate sixty persons who should be agreeable to both the Committee of Correspondence and the Committee of the Mechanics, all of whose names should be submitted to the Freeholders and Freemen of the City, at a Meeting to be called for that purpose, at the City Hall, for their approval and election;[1] all of which was evidently done and completed, on the twenty-second of November, exactly in conformity with the programme which the two political "rings" of that period, consolidated for the purpose of promoting their mutual political interests, had already prepared and promulgated.[2]

There is abundant evidence concerning the peculiar zeal of that new-formed Committee of Inspection—sometimes styled "THE COMMITTEE OF SIXTY," and at others, "THE COMMITTEE OF OBSERVATION"—in the discharge of its self-imposed duties;[3] but, generally, the purposes to which this work is specially devoted do not require a more extended notice of them, in this place. Those purposes require, however, that mention shall be made of the fact, in this connection, that whatever the Circular Letters which were sent to Westchester-county, by the Committee of Correspondence or by any other body, for the purpose of

[1] *Proceedings of the Conference with the Committee of Mechanics*, in the *Minutes of the Committee of Correspondence*, "NEW YORK, November 15, "1774."

[2] Holt's *New-York Journal*, No. 1664, NEW-YORK, Thursday, November 24, 1774; and *Rivington's New-York Gazetteer*, No. 84, NEW-YORK, Thursday, November 24, 1775.

"The first Thing done by the People of this place in consequence of "the Resolutions of the Congress, was the Dissolution of the Committee "of 51, in order to choose a new Committee of Inspection, to carry the "Measures of the Congress into effect. A Day was appointed by Advertisement for choosing sixty Persons to form this Committee. About 30 "or 40 Citizens only appeared at the Election, & chose the 60 who had "been previously named by the former Committee. I can no otherwise "my Lord account for the very small number of People who appeared on "this occasion, than by supposing that the Measures of the Congress "are generally Disrelished."—(*Lieutenant-governor Colden to the Earl of Dartmouth*, No. 9, "NEW YORK, December 7th, 1774.")

[3] *Lieutenant-governor Colden to Captain Montague*, "NEW-YORK, 8 Febry, "1775;" *the same to General Gage*, "NEW-YORK, 20th Febry, 1775;" *the "same to the Earl of Dartmouth*, "NEW YORK, 1st March, 1775;" Jones's *History of New York during the Revolutionary War*, i., 34; Leake's *Memoir of General John Lamb*, 97; etc.

enlisting her farmers in the support and execution of the *Association* or of any other of the measures or recommendations of the recent Congress, may have been or may have proposed, they were evidently entirely disregarded; and that, at least as recently as the early Winter of 1774–75, there was not sufficient interest, friendly to the revolutionary movements which were so deeply exciting the inhabitants of the neighboring City, within any portion of that rural County, to do even the paltry service of circulating those Circular Letters throughout the Towns; although there were a few, a very few, who were beginning to look favorably on those movements, and to talk and write, in the support of them. We shall notice all of these earlier demonstrations of which we possess any information, since they were the small beginnings of that Revolution, within the County of Westchester, of which so much has been said and written.

The first of these was a Letter, in support of the revolutionary movements and in answer to the tracts of "*A. W. Farmer*," which had made so much excitement, throughout the Colonies. It was written by a Weaver and published in Holt's *New-York Journal*, No. 1668, NEW-YORK, Thursday, December 22, 1774. The Editor assured his readers that it was actually written by a working Weaver, who lived in Harrison's Purchase;[1] and it was in these words:

"*To the city and country inhabitants, of the province of New York.*

"Friends, and fellow mortals,

"THE division between Britain, and her Colonies, is very alarming; but what I think "would be more alarming, is a division between the in-"habitants of the colonies; the effect of which we have "from holy writ, *that a house divided against itself,* "*cannot stand.* I have seen a pamphlet printed by "Mr. Rivington, entitled the *Country Farmer*, which "seems to be calculated to throw all into confusion, "& to no other end; and artfully to gain his point. "as a *Farmer*, he addresses himself to the Farmers, "and their wives; he tells the latter, they cannot "treat a neighbour with a dish of tea; and that will "be a dreadful thing indeed; to the former, he saith, "their produce will rot on their hands, and they can-"not pay their weaver, &c. Being a *Weaver* myself, "and tho' they be generally poor, still they are as "useful a set of men, as any in the world, and so will "remain, as long as, from the King to the peasant, "all are born naked. I therefore, would beg leave "to say a word in answer to our pretended Farmer, "and make no doubt but the lowness of stile I shall "speak in, will be excused, when it is considered that "a man may be a profound Weaver, and no gram-"marian; and being a useful branch of mankind as "above, ought to have the privilege of speaking in "his own stile. If so, then my first answer to our "*Farmer* is, that we Weavers, and I believe I may "say most of other trades too, cannot live without "meat, bread and clothing, all which I shall gladly "take in exchange for my labour; and If I could "earn more at the year's end, than a supply for my "family, I would be content, (at this troublesome "period, which our Farmer sets up for such a terror) "to have my employer say to my creditor. *I owe* "*the Weaver so much, which I will engage to pay to you,* "*when I can sell my produce.* It may be my creditor "may answer, *the produce will suit me*, and then all "will be well; but if not, the promise will answer at "this time, with every creditor that hath any spirit of "patriotism. Now to the *wives*, I would address my-"self as follows, viz. to remember when their parents "were first placed in the garden, that it was said to "the woman, *yea, hath God said ye shall not eat of* "*every tree of the garden?* but the woman was pre-"vailed on by a deceiver, to disobey the command, "and to eat. But O! the consequence! and so like-"wise, a deceiver now says to you *what! are you de-"nied the pleasure of drinking tea?* But I beg of you "not to be now deceived, nor prevailed on to bring "ruin and slavery on your country and posterity, by "tasting of that detestable herb, which hath already "been the cause of so much confusion. But if you "will not be entreated, but will persist in using it, "you will find your case similar to that of *Eve*, she "lost her innocence, and plunged all her descendants "into everlasting misery; you will lose liberty, and "plunge your descendants into everlasting slavery.

"The *Farmer* too, complains bitterly about not "transporting *sheep*. I wish to God, the congress "had let us send away our *black sheep;* for then per-"haps this pretended *Farmer*, might have been *trans-"ported* before he could have made such a *bleating.*

"Now I would beg leave to say a few words on his "clamour against our *delegates*. He calls them *trait-"ors*, which name, he had much better have taken "on himself, where it might have been applied "with propriety. I cannot see any room for this vil-"est of mankind, to insinuate, that those men would "attempt to betray their country. Besides their un-"spotted characters, are they not men of extensive "interests in America? have they estate in any other "country? No, what then should induce them to "betray America, seeing that if America falls, they "must fall with it? This consideration alone, is suf-"ficient to clear them from our *Farmer's* aspersion. "But in my opinion, a still stronger security for their "integrity and faithful discharge of the trust reposed "in them, is, the unblemished character they have

[1] "The public may be assured, that the following letter is the production of a real, and not a fictitious weaver in West Chester. It is the "off-spring of an honest warmth in the cause of his country; and tho' "his sentiments, and remarks, appear in a homespun dress, they never-"theless are not without force, and we presume, will contribute to the "entertainment of our readers."—(*Editorial, introductory to the letter of the Weaver.*)

"ever supported; nor in this do I trust alone to "common fame, having known Mr. Jay, from his "early youth, and had some acquaintance with Mr. "Duane, from which I have had so much reason to "confide in them, that I could contentedly trust them "to contend for my liberty, or my life. And on the "whole, I think that it would be well for us farmers, "and mechanicks to consider whether it is not likely "that each colony took as much care in choosing "their delegates, as we did. That is, to send men of "knowledge, men of interest, and men of honour. If "so, we must look on our *farmer* to be a man wholly "given to ridicule, misrepresentation, and malevo-"lence; for he hath declared that most honourable "and never to be forgotten congress, to be either a "set of *ignorant men*, or else to be *traitors!*

"I would now recommend to the notice of every "reader of *Rivington's Farmer*, that it is the usual "practice of evil minded persons, when they would "disturb the quiet of any man, or body of men, "against whom they can find no just cause of com-"plaint, to raise against them, without any evidence, "the highest clamours, suggest the most criminal de-"signs, and if possible, represent even their most "laudable actions in an odious light: The best char-"acters and most commendable actions, are no secur-"ities against attacks like these of the *Farmer*, to "which the best of men are most exposed; but it is "a proof against them, that they are unsupported by "*reason*, or by *credible evidence;* when, if either had "existed, they would certainly have been produced "by the same malevolence that raised the clamour "without them. I would only desire the reader to "consider the *Farmer's* clamour, invectives and "abuse, calmly and dispassionately, give them their "due weight and no more. I would not even desire to "turn them upon his own head, and cause him, like "Haman, to be hanged on his own gallows—I only "desire that, unjust and unreasonable as they are, "they may have no weight with the reader, or raise "any prejudice in his mind against the cause of truth "& his country, or against any man or body of men, "especially those worthy men who have nobly stood "forth and exerted themselves to save their country "from slavery and destruction.

"I come now to consider his clamour against the "citizens, in which he declares, at a certain time, "there was no magistrate with virtue enough to do "his duty; and that there is no merchant he would "trust. I don't recollect any thing said of the law-"yers, but he hath been severe upon the mayor and "commonalty, on account of the *snipe act*, with "which act, if he had gone a little further, he would "amply have justified our struggle, with the mother "country.

"I would ask, why does not that act continue in "force to this day?

"The answer is, because the country people were "very unanimous in opposition to it; though it was "to the loss of individuals, myself for one, still they "stood out; which caused the framers of that act to "consider closely the consequences which would at-"tend its continuance—and so it was thought best to "make it void. Here we may see the effect of a "steady opposition to an odious law: and similar "causes will produce similar effects. We may assure "ourselves that a steady and firm opposition to the "late acts of Parliament, will cause our sovereign to "examine into the state of the case with great atten-"tion; and when he finds he has been led into un-"warrantable acts by diabolical counsellors, he will "dismiss them from their offices, by which they have "wickedly devised to throw the nation all into con-"fusion, and thereby to dethrone the King.

"Therefore my fellow mortals, let me beseech you, "as you value your liberty, and the liberty of your "posterity, take the advice of the ever to be admired "and revered Congress, stick close to the non-con-"sumption agreement, and lay aside those unneces-"sary diversions, which but too often end in the de-"struction of both soul and body. If it should seem "grievous for the present, we have this for our con-"solation, that as good men as you and I, have been "afflicted: The devil was permitted to afflict Job "worse than wicked Ministers, or Counsellors of "state can you and me; and let us take patern by "his stability, when his friends came and clamoured "against him, as bad as our Farmer doth in this day, "against the best men we have among us; and when "his wife advised him to *curse God and die*, what was "the effect? why nothing at all, for it was full conso-"lation for him to say, *I know that my redeemer liv-"eth;* and in another place, *all the days of my ap-"pointed time will I wait, till my change come.*

"This is an amiable example of stability, which, "may Americans imitate. May they join corre-"sponding actions to fervent *prayers*, that they may be "enabled to maintain their rights and liberties! That "the British arms may never be employed but in a "just cause,—to protect the weak and innocent from "wrong, and to be the terror of oppressors and evil "doers. That the illustrious house of Hanover may "continue to be the defenders of true religion and "virtue, the faithful guardians of our freedom and "property! That our sovereign, George the third, "may discover every wicked design, that any of his "Ministers, or others, have conceived against him, or "any of his people! That he may be endowed with "wisdom and virtue to become a blessing to his peo-"ple, and a terror only to his enemies! That his "days may be prosperous and many, and his end "peaceful and happy! And may all the subjects of "him and his successors, be ever watchful and reso-"lute to prevent the least encroachment upon their "rights and liberties, on the preservation of which, "the happiness of both King and people depends!

"And as a powerful means of preserving the bless-"ings of freedom, may we be all duly sensible of the

"importance of choosing proper persons to represent "us in our legislative assembly, and of being ex-"tremely careful in our choice.—All which are the "fervent wishes of A WEAVER, in Harrison's Pur-"chase, West Chester County."

About the same time that this letter appeared, there was a movement, in the vicinity of the White Plains, to obtain a nominal approval, if no more, of the action, the revolutionary action, of the Committee of the City of New York; but if what was said of the result of the effort by those who were opposed to the movement, without contradiction, may be believed, only "three or four persons in the White Plains" participated in it; and, practically, it was a failure.

Very soon after the end of the movement referred to, however, there was a counter-movement, in the same vicinity, in which a *Declaration* was circulated and signed by the Freeholders and principal Inhabitants, in which the conservatism of those who signed it was distinctly asserted. As a part of the earlier literature of the Revolution, in Westchester-county, we have thought that *Declaration* possesses sufficient of interest to entitle it to a place in this narrative. It was in these words, very carefully copied from the original publication, in *Rivington's New-York Gazetteer*, No. 91, NEW-YORK, Thursday, January 12, 1775:

"To the PRINTER.

"Sir,

"WE the subscribers, freeholders and inhabit-"ants in the White Plains, in the county "of Westchester, think it our duty to our King and "country, to declare, that we have never given our "consent to any Resolves touching the disputes with "the mother country, nor are we any ways concerned "in any measures entered into relative to them. We "are rather induced to do this, because we under-"stand, that three or four persons in the White "Plains, have taken upon them to declare to the "Committee at New-York, the consent of the "inhabitants of the White Plains to the resolutions "entered into, in New-York, and their acquiescence "with the measures taken there; when the major "part of the few people who attended the meeting, "did not choose to be concerned in the matter. We "also testify our disapprobation of many hot and "furious proceedings against the measures taken by "the mother country, as, in our opinion, they will "rather tend to ruin this once happy continent, than "remove grievances. We also declare that we desire "to live and die peaceable subjects to our gracious "Sovereign King *GEORGE* the Third and his laws. "This is to inform the public, that the above declara-"tion was signed by forty-five freeholders and in-"habitants, in the small precinct of the White "Plains, against the proceedings of the New-York "Committee, besides Miles Oakley."

A few weeks afterwards, Miles Oakley, one of those who had signed it, undoubtedly, for good and sufficient reasons,[1] retracted what he had uttered in the above-recited *Declaration*; and we have carefully copied from Holt's *New-York Journal*, No. 1681, NEW-YORK, Thursday, March 23, 1775, what he said on that latter occasion. It was in these words:

"Westchester County, White Plains.

"WHEREAS, there was a petition published in "Rivington's paper, some time past, that "forty five of the freeholders and inhabitants, be-"sides Miles Oakley, did sign a petition—I did sign "a petition, something like it, by being misled; and "afterwards being informed into the right state of "the matter, I got the petition, and struck my name "out, and forwarned the Esq. A. H—not to return "my name and he swore by God he would; and "many others that signed it, has told me, they was "sorry they had any concern in signing the petition.

"MILES OAKLEY, and
"DANIEL HORTON."

There was no portion of the County of Westchester, in which the conservatism of the inhabitants was so general and so decided in its character, as in the Manor of Cortlandt;[2] and, during the Winter

[1] On the 8th of May, 1775, Miles Oakley was appointed a member of the County Committee, (*vide page —, post;*) soon afterwards, he received a Warrant for Second Lieutenant in Captain Mills's Company; (*vide page —, post;*) and he served in that office, under Colonel Holmes, in the bloodless Campaign of 1775; leaving the service, when the Campaign closed.—(*Historical Manuscripts*, etc.: *Military Committee*, xxv., 94.)

Daniel Horton, whose name accompanied that of Miles Oakley, on the disclaimer now under notice, was a resident of Rye; and in the re-organization of the Militia of the County, he was made Second Lieutenant of the Rye and Mamaroneck Company, commanded by Captain Robert Bloomer.

[2] Illustrative of the statement made in the text, is the following, taken from the *Upcott Clippings*, iv., 297, in the Library of the New York Historical Society: "It is said that at least three-fourths of the people "in Cortlandt's Manor, New York, have declared their unwillingness to "enter into the Congressional measures: that a great number of the "people in general in Westchester County are preparing to do the like; "and that the *Association* against the Continental Congress has been "signed by three hundred persons in the neighborhood of Poughkeepsie "only. Many lists are sent about Dutchess County, on which also "many hundreds have subscribed."

As far as it related to Westchester-county, the above was copied from Gaine's *New-York Gazette: and the Weekly Mercury*, No. 1226, NEW-YORK, Monday, February 27, 1775.

It must not be supposed, however, that the farmers in Westchester-county supported the Home Government, in its Colonial policy: on the contrary, neither in the well-known *Declaration and Protest*, nor elsewhere, as far as we have knowledge, was there the slightest leaning in that direction—they did no more, at any time, than to prefer and accept that opposition to the Home Government which had been made by the General Assembly of the Colony of New York, instead of that which was made by the Continental Congress of 1774; and, at no time, as the reader will hereafter learn, was the great body of them inclined to support the Royal Cause, with their persons and their properties. There were some who were smarting under the outrages which had been inflicted on them or on their friends, by local and other despots, of high or low degree; and these were, sometimes, compelled to find refuge and protection within the lines of the Royal Army; and there was a floating, vicious class, within the County, which the lawlessness of the revolutionary faction and the succeeding War had produced—ready to enlist on that side which offered the greater inducements—but the great body of the farmers was patient, law-abiding, peacefully inclined, stayers at home, industrious, and severely conservative.

of 1774–75 and early in the Spring of the latter year, there was considerable activity, among the farmers on that particular Manor, in opposition to the revolutionary spirit which was seeking to force itself on them. *An Association*, referred to in the Note 2, on page 42, ante, had been prepared and numerously signed in Duchess-county; and copies of it had been also circulated and signed within Westchester-county, especially within the Manor of Cortlandt, which adjoined the Duchess-county of that period;[1] and, about the same time, an *Address*, accompanied with an *Association* adapted to that particular locality, was prepared and widely circulated; and the *Association* was numerously signed. That very interesting and very important *Address* and the *Association* which accompanied it,—the latter, generally known, among those who favored the revolutionary faction, as "*The Loyalist's Test*"—because they form very important specimens of the literature of revolutionary Westchester-county, and because of their importance as reliable authorities for the guidance of the student of the history of that County, during that eventful period, may properly find a place in this narrative; and we have carefully copied them from *Rivington's New-York Gazetteer*, No. 96, NEW-YORK, Thursday, February 16, 1775. They were in the following words:

[1] The following is a copy of those notable "RESOLVES," as that *Association* was frequently called, carefully made from Gaine's *New-York Gazette: and the Weekly Mercury*, No. 1218, NEW-YORK, Monday February 13, 1775, where they were printed among the current news of the day:

"WE the subscribers being desirous to convince mankind that "we are firmly attached to our most happy constitution, "and are disposed to support and maintain peace and good order under "his Majesty's government, do therefore declare, that our sovereign lord "king George the third, is the only sovereign to whom British America "may, can, or ought to owe and bear true and faithful allegiance, and "that there is no legal power or authority therein but what is duly "derived from him; that our representatives in General Assembly con-"vened, are the only guardians of our rights and liberties; that without "them no laws can here be made to bind us, and that they only are the "channel through which our grievances can properly be represented for "redress, and that to support their right and authority, we do hereby "associate and mutually covenant and engage to and with each other "as follows, namely:

"*First.* That we will upon all occasions stand by and assist each other "in the defence of his life, liberty and property, when ever the same "shall be attacked or endangered by any bodies of men riotously assem-"bled, upon any pretence or any authority whatsoever, not warranted "by the laws of the land.

"*Second.* That we will upon all occasions mutually support each "other in the free exercise and enjoyment of our undoubted right to "liberty, in eating, drinking, buying, selling, communing and acting "what, with whom, and as we please, consistent with the laws of God, "and the laws of the land, notwithstanding the association entered into "by the Continental Congress to the contrary.

"*Lastly.* That we will endeavour to promote, encourage, and when "called to, enforce obedience to the rightful authority of our most gra-"cious sovereign king George the third, and the laws which can, do, or "may constitutionally extend to, or in the British colonies in America.

"In witness whereof we have hereunto set our hands, this eighteenth "day of January, in the fifteenth year of the reign of our sovereign "lord George the third, by the grace of God of Great-Britain, France, "and Ireland, king, defender of the faith, &c., and in the year of our "Lord Christ, 1775."

"An Address to the Inhabitants of Cort-"landt's Manor.

"I am one amongst you, tho' yet a "stranger, an inhabitant of Cort-"landt's manor; I have nothing to dread or fear "from the resentment of any person or persons, as "I mean to give no offence to any individual; "only wishing, that reason and common prudence "may take place of present bickerings, and the "detestable poison of party faction. It is a matter no "longer to be hid under a cloud, whether we are in "reality, his Majesty's loyal subjects or not; I have "all the reason in the world to believe, that the "worthy people of this Manor are so to all intents "and purposes; I mean as to their private sentiments; "but alas! my friends, the time is at hand, when "those sentiments alone will not be of sufficient va-"lidity to justify the loyalty of your hearts. It re-"quires no great penetration to assign reasons for your "silence in matters of so great importance; your con-"duct, my friends in this last point, is not to be "blamed; it rather redounds to your credit in the "eyes of every one that knows the life of a farmer. "The farmer is brought up to peace and tranquility; "politics, and the designs of crafty men are strangers "to his honest minds; his care and toil, with the "sweat of his brow, is to turn the furrows which give "us subsistence: It is from industry, that worthy "merchants are enabled to extend their commerce,—"commerce! the vitals of a nation, every country has "its share in different commodities, designed by the "will of an omnipotent Being to depend on each other, "linked in a chain of civil society. I presume it will "not be improper to see what part of this advantage "providence has allotted us; the question may be "easily solved; we are placed in a fertile land, teem-"ing forth, in abundance, the necessaries of life for "ourselves, and a superfluity, which brings the wealth "of other nations to our own coffers.—Every individ-"ual enjoys his share according to his industry and "situation in life; he is protected in his possessions, "by what? 'Tis by the paternal care, the penetrating "eye, and the mighty arm of his mother country; who "like a hen, when the hawk is near, hovers round her "chickens, takes them under her wings, and preserves "them from the enemy. I think I have accounted "for your inattention to political matters, as not being "within the sphere of your occupations, but confined "to the laudable pursuit of your own business; and, "I sincerely wish it to continue without interruption; "to effect which, there is only one method left.—I "have already observed, that our good intentions, "kept in silence, are not sufficient to distinguish our "loyalty; It may do amongst ourselves; but let us "consider facts which we know to be true; they are "recent in our memories, and need not recapitula-"tion; it is sufficient that we are informed of the con-

"sequences in England, where they are considered as "actions founded on rebellious principles, subversive "of all law and government, and abusive, in the high-"est degree, to his Majesty's crown and dignity. I "have said, I am one amongst you, my situation has "given me opportunity to form ideas of your behav-"iour and sentiments, I believe you, in a general "sense, firmly attached to loyalty and our admirable "constitution; that you wish to live and die subjects "only to the British empire; but how is this to be "manifested, and that it should be declared, there is "an absolute necessity, without delay, for the follow-"ing reasons: That the colonists of New-York are "under the same dilemma with the other provinces "and the continent throughout, considered as com-"binants in a general plan, which gives so much "offence to the supreme authority, whose dignity "cannot, nor will not, be insulted. Let us of Cort-"landt's manor, clear ourselves of the general impu-"tation; we do not deserve it, then, why should we "suffer it? We never consented to congresses nor "committees, we detest the destruction of private "property, we abhor the proceedings of riotous and "disorderly people, and finally, we wish to live and "die the same loyal subjects we have ever been, to his "most sacred Majesty GEORGE the THIRD. Let us "my friends, declare, and acknowledge this, our in-"dispensible duty, by signing our names to the paper "now circulating in this manor, wrote and adapted "for the subscription of none but ROYALISTS.—It is "not enough for a man to say, that I am a loyal sub-"ject, no more than to say I am a pious and true "christian; it must be his work, his dependance on, "his energy, his indefatigable effort; to promote honor "and glory to the true system of his preservation. As "charity, my friends, is a characteristic of a good man "and a christian, I wish by no means it should be im-"paired, in this our manor of Cortlandt; permit me, "my neighbours, to instance one point in particular "to which I hope you will pay strict adherence, viz. "If you should disagreeably find any one, or more "amongst you who are blind to their own happiness, "let me intreat you to take no advantage of their "weakness, rather use lenient and mild persuasions; "tell them their true interest; use all your endeav-"ours that if possible they may return to their right "senses:—In this you will shine in triple capacity, "you recover the lost man, you draw together the "bands of unity, and are an honor to your King and "country."

"Form of an Association in Cortlandt's "Manor.

"WHEN the minds of people "are agitated, some with "just, and some with false ideas of their rights "and privileges, when anarchy and confusion are "spreading their baneful wings over this once "happy and flourishing Continent: At this most "interesting period, it is the duty of every indi-"vidual, for the good of himself and posterity, to "pursue that course which conscience dictates to be "right. No one, if impartial, can be at a loss for the "clue of direction, the object is plain to every honest, "tho' ever so illiterate capacity: The loyalty we owe "to the best of Kings is the grand magnetic point, "that will infallibly fix us on a solid basis. There are "none amongst us (if we cooly reflect) but what will "find themselves bound by the strongest ties of grati-"tude, to acknowledge that we have been, and still "may be, the happiest people on earth, under the "glorious and unparalelled constitution of Great "Britain! And if prejudice, popular declamations, "and the hateful current of party faction, are not too "strong for truth and matters of fact; we must allow "that the grand pitch of commerce we have arrived "at, the progress we have made in arts and sciences; "the amazing repadity in extending, settling and im-"proving our land estates; the magnificent appear-"ance and flourishing condition of our towering cit-"ies; the opulence of the inhabitants, and every other "blessing under God which we *do*, and still *may* en-"joy, derived their origin from, and have their exis-"tence in the laws, the lenity, and the unlimited "indulgence of our parent state; which has hitherto "protected us, is ever able, and would be ready, if we "deserve it, to defend us against all invaders of our "peace and tranquility, by sending to our support the "terror of the universe, the BRITISH ARMS!—For a "proof of this let us revert to the late war, when the "French and Savages with fire and sword, were rav-"aging the country; when the cries of murder and "scalping were echoed from every quarter of the "woods; the infants brains dashed out before the eyes "of its afflicted parents; the parents tortured to death "by the horrid and shocking barbarities of the Indi-"ans; and numbers flying from their habitations, ex-"posed to famine, and every species of distress. Let "us reflect on those direful calamities; Let us be "grateful to the power which preserved us, which sent "forth her INVINCIBLE VETERANS, vanquished our "enemies, and finally reinstated us in quiet posses-"sion of our own.—If we have a right to complain of "the British acts of parliament, we have a Governor, "Council and Assembly, to represent our grievances "to the KING, LORDS and COMMONS; we are assured "that we shall be heard: We have no business with "*Congresses* and *Committees*. Such methods only serve "to irritate our best friends. Let us proceed in the "direct line o. our duty: We are contending with a "mighty nation, of great mercy and long forbearance, "ever sparing of the effusion of blood; but when "rouzed to resentment, we may feel the weight of her "indignation.—Therefore we, the subscribers, free-"holders, and inhabitants of Cortlandt's Manor, in "the county of Westchester, being actuated by no "other motives than the dictates of conscience and

"common sense, are led to declare our firm and indis-"soluble attachment to our most gracious Sovereign "GEORGE the THIRD, his crown and dignity; and "with grateful hearts to acknowledge, that we are in-"debted to his paternal care, for the preservation of "our lives and fortunes: And as we have ever been a "happy and free people, subject only to the laws and "government of Great-Britain, we will pay no regard "to any resolves, or restrictions, but such as are en-"joined us by our CONSTITUTIONAL DELEGATES. "Everything to the contrary, we deem ILLEGAL."

An answer to this *Address* and this *Association* was published in *Rivington's New-York Gazetteer*, No. 99, NEW-YORK, Thursday, March 9, 1775, in these words, which we have carefully copied from the original publication:

"To *every* American to *whom it is applicable;*

"But chiefly to

"The ASSOCIATORS *of* Cortlandt's Manor.

"*O ye Tame Pigeons!*

"EXCUSE, my friends, the manner of addressing "you, for if we advert to a passage in Holy "Writ, we are told, that the professors of our excel-"lent religion, should be *as wise as serpents, and* "*harmless as doves;* I must, in some measure, think "you a Christian people, as both the above properties "are discovered in Cortlandt's Manor, tho' they "seem not to be properly blended together.—The "framer of the Association, and the elaborate piece "that attended it, in Mr. Rivington's paper of Feb-"ruary 16, has certainly all the subtilty of the ser-"pent; and has as dexterously wormed himself "round your estates, with as much address, and will "probably have the same success, as the first serpent "had, when he attacked our old grandmother.—And "you, my friends, resemble the simple dove, for you "seem to be innocent and secure, although the de-"luder has already catched you in the snare: Then "be not offended at my calling you pigeons; for "naturalists assure us, it is the very nature of this bird, "that she seems always calm and secure, and has no "inclination to defend herself, or her young ones, "from the attacks of men, beasts, or vermin, but al-"ways returns to the same hole to make her nest, "notwithstanding the experience she has had, of its "being utter destruction to her family.—Just so it is "with you, ye people of Cortlandt, *ye have eyes, but* "*see not, and ears, but hear not.* The Spectator, in "some of his beautiful lucubrations, mentions a young "Eastern Prince, who being severely reprimanded for "some unguarded folly of youth, immediately fell "down at the feet of his preceptor, and expressed "himself to this effect:—O father, I now perceive, "that I have two souls, a good soul and a bad, in "your absence the bad soul predominates; passion "and pleasure, with their attendant train of delusions, "absorbe my frame; reason and virtue are forced to "quit their seats!—But in your presence, the good "soul assumes the throne; reason, truth, and virtue "appear in all their native forms, and every vicious "passion is banished from my heart.

"However this may be with an individual, it is "clearly evident, that the inhabitants of the British "dominions are actuated by two sorts of souls, and "these are of very different kinds: But let us exam-"ine them; the soul of the virtuous son of Freedom, "is the soul of God! the soul of nature, and the soul "of the British Constitution; it is a soul that dares "to think, that dares to speak, that dares to die! "This soul has animated every kingdom on the face "of the earth, till by their own crimes and their own "folly, they have voluntarily banished it "their soil: This is the soul that has sup-"ported the British state through various revolu-"tions, and will maintain its empire, either in that, "or some other part of the globe, till Heaven, in its "vengeance, shall extirpate the human race.—Now, "the souls of the other cast, may be divided into two "classes; and first, those in the island of Britain, "who erroneously call themselves friends to govern-"ment; and are generally distinguished by the name "of Tories: and these should be called despotic "souls, as they well deserve the appellation; for, by "their alert address, they have had influence enough "to buy all the votes in the Kingdom; and the min-"istry has had foresight enough to buy all them; so "that, all the laws of that once great nation, are now "framed, passed, and executed by one branch of the "legislature: And the consequences have been cor-"respondent; equity, justice, and reason, with all "the antient props of the state, are banished the sen-"ate: tyranny mounts her throne, and says,—I "WILL! The other class of souls reside in America, "and must be called souls of the basest mould; these "wretches, by the God of nature, have been suffered "to receive their being in a land of happiness, and "have been nursed up in a land of liberty and "plenty; but O monstrous ingratitude! Without "the least remorse, without any spur to real ambi-"tion, they forsake their country! in short they are "divested of every trace of human perfection, except "one trifling gleam of hope, which the devil has ever "made use of to delude his votaries; and this, will "eventually end in despair. Yet these mens souls, "dare attempt with their Syren songs, to lull even "virtue itself to sleep, in the hopes that she may yet "split on the rocks.—One day we are charmed with "peace, clemency, and pardon; riches and plenty "are to be powered into our dwellings; tyrants and "heroes are to drop their crowns and their laurels at "our feet, that we may partake of the banquet, if we "will only bow the knee to satan. But, if we are "stern enough to deny passive obedience, then ter-

"ror and dismay are to assault us, all the British "navy shall knock down our pompous cities; thou- "sands and tens of thousands of forces are to crimson "o'er the spacious plains with blood; Canadian big- "otry and persecution is to pour in upon us from "the North; the Indians, with horrid barbarity, are "to torment us from the West; and perhaps pesti- "lence and Spaniards from the South.—This, ye sor- "did mortals, is the true picture of your base hearts; "this is the scene, on which you could feast your "eyes with rapture, provided the rocks and the "mountains might cover you.—But now let me tell "you, that were all this possible, there are fifteen out "of twenty, throughout this vast continent, all Free- "dom's sons, whose blood is neither contaminated "with paltry bribe, or coward fear; who would face "all this terror, rather than sell their birthright for a "mess of pottage, or be a means of transmitting mis- "ery and infamy to their posterity.

"But, O ye men of Cortlandt, let us for a moment "view the windings of that arch serpent which hath "beguiled you; with what pleasing sensations, he "surveys your fine fields, your harvests, and your "herds; and how he commends and admires the "trickling drops that pour down your brows; no "doubt these are delicious charms to him; yet, one "thing on your part, is absolutely necessary; and "that is, your loyalty, only establish that, and he can "easily take care of the rest of your business.—With "what elegance of stile he describes your fertile "plains, your splendid cities, your noble towers, and "the oppulence of your marts, which has poured all "the riches of the globe into your laps! and all this, "thro' the paternal indulgence of a tender mother. "But he has neglected to inform you, that, for these "12 years past, this kind mother has become a "monster! Like the cruel ostrich, she has forsaken "her young ones; with the fierceness of a tyger, she "lays waste our own fair inheritence, and dashes "her sons against the stones!—Shakspeare makes "Hamlet express himself thus; 'But, I am pigeon "'livered, and lack gall to make oppression bitter.' "Whether it is the lack of gall, or the lack of sensi- "bility, that makes you callous to that bitter oppres- "sion that now surrounds you, I will not determine; "but for creatures, that are said to wear the image of "the Deity, to be so lost to every noble sentiment "that ornaments the man; must bespeak the most "amazing apathy.—Then let me conjure you, to rise "from your lethargy, assume the dignity of freemen; "smite the serpents that have spread their poisons "round you; burn your associations; and with "dauntless intrepity, join the sons of freedom, who "are the only temporal guardians of the human race.

"B. E."

No further attempt to answer this *Address* nor to counteract the effects of the *Association* appears to have been made until late in the Spring, a long time after the farmers throughout the Manor had commenced their work of ploughing and sowing and planting, when the following letter, signed by "AN "INHABITANT," was published in Gaine's *New-York Gazette: or the Weekly Mercury*, No. 1236, NEW-YORK, Monday, June 19, 1775.

"TO THE INHABITANTS OF THE MANOR OF CORT- "LANDT, NEW-YORK.

"MANOR OF CORTLANDT, May 19, 1775.

"GENTLEMEN:

"The dangerous innovations and in- "fringements attempted by certain mercenary Min- "isterial tools and infamous traitors (in this Manor) "to their Country, who assume to themselves the "name of Loyalists, on the liberties of their fellow- "subjects, have greatly alarmed the impartial friends "of Liberty herein. A fool, says an author, has "great need of title; it teaches men to call him "Count and Duke, and to forget his proper name of "Fool.

"In a day when American pulse beats high for "Liberty; when it is the subject of almost every "public paper, as well as topic of discourse, it might "justly have been expected that no American would "be so hardy as to violate the rights of his fellow- "subjects; and if any such monster should appear "in this land of Liberty, that there would not be "wanting advocates for so glorious and important a "cause, as to expose those of its members who are "trampling on the sacred rights of the people.

"I have waited with great impatience, expecting "that some able hand would have undertaken the "benevolent task to warn you to beware of the con- "duct of some of the basest villains that ever dis- "graced any society, and draw the attention of the "inhabitants to its danger; but finding that although "now some months are elapsed since the commence- "ment of the measures of these traitors, &c., yet none "has appeared to sound the friendly alarm to the "very indolent inhabitants, I have attempted what "I so ardently wished might have been done by some "more able hand. While we are straining every "nerve to baffle foreign attempts to enslave us, surely "it must be very criminal in the descendants of "Britons, who ought to love life and liberty alike, to "be so assiduous in exerting themselves to enslave "their fellow-subjects.

"It may not be improper to inform you, Gentle- "men, of the springs and motives which induce these "principal movers to forget their duty to God, their "fellow-countrymen, and their posterity.

"They, anxious to secure to themselves and their "posterity power and authority, and to engross some "offices or pensions from or under the Crown, have "made a sacrifice of all public virtue on the altar of "self-interest. This desperate spirit it was that in- "duced these traitors or mercenary hirelings to exert "their influence to bring about the detestable meas- "ures proposed by a certain paper handed about here

" Winter, entitled '*The Loyalist's Test.*'[1] But, happily for this Manor, this very dangerous scheme was disconcerted by some lovers of Loyalty and Liberty. For the men who would make such inroads on the liberties of the people, as they were aiming at, to gratify their thirst for power, and give Administration a high idea of their influence in this Manor, would, from the same principle, exert every nerve of influence to carry any ministerial mandate into execution, at the expense of the liberties of their fellow-countrymen.

"Can any judicious American son of liberty behold these traitors of their Country without the utmost abhorrence, by whose influence the more illiterate and those who are unacquainted with the principles of the present dispute, are so besotted as to resign their liberties into the hands of the most ambitious and designing fellows, who are aiming to make a merit with the Ministry by enslaving their fellow-countrymen, and to aggrandise themselves and their posterity? Surely he cannot. If Charles the First deserved the axe, and James the Second the loss of his Kingdom, for changing the Constitution, and thereby trampling on the rights of their subjects, I leave you, my Countrymen, to judge what punishment would be adequate to the crimes of these loyalists and their tools, who are aiming at the same by a sacrifice of all public virtue and the liberty of their Country.

"AN INHABITANT."

With the publication of this letter, the Manor of Cortlandt probably closed its literary labors, in the cause of either party, since the work of the successive seasons occupied the entire attention of the Tenantry, and the Proprietors, also, found other subjects which commanded their attention; but the great body of the farmers, on the Manor, like those in the neighboring County of Duchess, continued to be conservative and without sympathy with those who were in rebellion, to the end of the War.

During the greater portion of the period in which had occurred the various transactions of which mention has been made, herein, the General Assembly of the Colony of New York had not been permitted, by the Colonial Government, to meet for the consideration of the public affairs and for the transaction of the public business of the Colony; but a large proportion, if not a majority, of the Members of the House, in their individual characters, were known to have sympathized, to a greater or lesser extent, with the less radical portion of the party of the Opposition, in the Colony, while the Committee of Correspondence of the House, in which was vested, *ad interim*, much of the authority of the House, was also known to have united with the local Committees of Correspondence, in New York and elsewhere, in proposing the convention of a Congress of all the Colonies, for consultation and advice, in the matter of the great grievances to which the Colonies were said to have been subjected, unconstitutionally, by the Parliament and the Ministry of Great Britain. It was a matter of deep concern, therefore, both in the Colonial Government and among the Colonists, generally, when, on the tenth of January, 1775, that body was permitted to assemble, in an Adjourned Session;[2] and, in the absence of more exciting occurrences and in view of many anxious hopes that that Assembly, which had not been concerned in any of the extraordinary occurrences of the preceding twelve months, might, possibly, become instrumental in restoring harmony between the Mother Country and the Colonies—"most ardently desired by all good men"[3]—the eyes of all careful observers, in Europe and America, were directed, wistfully, toward the little chamber, in the old City-Hall, in Wall-street, in the City of New York, in which that General Assembly was assembled.

The members of that Assembly, as was well-known, like the body of the Colonists whom they respectively represented, were of the confederated party of the Opposition, and, to a man, antagonistic to the Colonial policy of the Home Government; but, also like their constituents, they were divided—in some instances, they were radically divided—in their views and in their inclinations, concerning the manner in which that opposition should be presented and through what instrumentality it should be exercised. A portion of those members, respectable in character and ability, but a minority in numbers, led by George Clinton, Philip Schuyler, and Peter R. Livingston, asserting its continued loyalty to the Sovereign, its desire to effect a redress of the grievances under which the Colonies were laboring, and its hope that a reconciliation between the Colonies and the Mother Country might be secured, nevertheless, fell back on the Congress and on the line of action on which the Congress had determined, notwithstanding the well-known tendency toward Revolution of all which that Congress had done, and notwithstanding, also, the equally well-known effects of that action, because of its ill-concealed encouragement of Insurrection if not of Rebellion, on a large portion of the Colonists, throughout the Continent, and on the Home Government. Another portion of those members, equally respectable in character and ability, constituting a large majority of the House, and led by Isaac Wilkins, James De Lancey, and Crean Brush, was not less opposed to the Colonial policy of the Home Government, nor less decided and sincere in its opposition to that policy, nor less desirous of effecting a redress of the grievances under which the Colonies were said to have been suffering, nor more hopeful that a recon-

[1] Vide pages 43, 44, 45, ante.

[2] *Journal of the Assembly*, Die Martis, 10 ho., A.M., the 10th January, 1775.

[3] *Resolution of the House of Representatives of Massachusetts*, inviting a Meeting of Deputies, in a Congress of the Continent, June 17, 1774.

ciliation between the Colonies and the Mother Country might be effected; but it also maintained, in opposition to the minority of the House and more consistently with the uniform profession of loyalty to the Sovereign and of respect for the fundamental principles of the Constitution, in both of which all, the minority as well as the majority, professed to be in harmony, that a removal of the causes of the disaffection and a restoration of harmony between the excited disputants could not be secured by the use of such means as the Congress had recommended and authorized, no matter by whom organized and controlled; and that, for those well-defined purposes, it would be preferable to adopt and employ only those means which would give offence to no one, and only those instrumentalities concerning which there could not be raised any question of their legitimacy nor of their entire fitness, within the law, for the due promotion of the great ends for which, alone, all professed to be contending. The first-named portion of the members, was, evidently, determined to force the Assembly into the line of the radical portion of the party of the Opposition, for no other purpose, however, than that of increasing the moral weight of that particular faction of the party, in its desperate struggle for the possession of the controlling power, in political affairs, within the Colony; and this, too, notwithstanding that success in such determined effort could only result in destroying the one remaining body, legally constituted and entirely unsmirched by any association with any less legally constituted body, through which the Home Government could be reached, officially, in whatever action should be taken in behalf of "the common cause;"[1] and notwithstanding, also, that the supporters of the Congress, in the event of their success, would, thereby, destroy a most powerful instrumentality, then preparing to labor, independently, in a line which whilst parallel to that already occupied by the Congress itself, was, nevertheless, for the accomplishment of the great purposes for securing which that Congress had been originally proposed and was subsequently organized, and was, then, among other less desirable purposes, through its own appointed instrumentalities, apparently laboring. The last-named portion of the members, not less determined than the other, resolutely maintained that the Assembly should remain entirely independent from all those popular Committees and Congresses which had been moving and laboring, during the preceding year, in lines of action which they had respectively approved, each for itself, for the common purposes; and, with equal resolution and consistency, it evidently determined, also, that the Assembly should take no official action on any of the occurrences of the preceding year, except such as should be brought before it, officially, or such as might have arisen from some prior action of the Assembly itself; and, more important than all else, it determined that, with all the weight of its legitimate and official authority and influence and with all the personal influence of its individual members, but after a fashion and in terms of its own selection, and without any violation of official or individual propriety or of the Laws of the Land—especially without officially recognizing the existence of any other opposition to the Ministry or the existence of any other organized body which had been, which was, or which might become, similarly employed—it would vigorously oppose the obnoxious Colonial policy of the Home Government, earnestly seek a redress of the serious grievances under which the Colonies were then laboring, and honestly endeavor to effect that honorable and permanent reconciliation of the Colonies and the Mother Country, which all factions, and all parties, and all sects, and all classes of society, throughout the Colony, professed to consider necessary and desirable; and which, some in one manner and some in others, each faction for itself, they were endeavoring to secure, for the common weal.[2]

The County of Westchester was ably represented on the floor of the Assembly, in the persons of Colonel Frederic Philipse and Judge John Thomas, who represented the body of the County; Pierre Van Cortlandt, who represented the Manor of Cortlandt; and Isaac Wilkins, who represented the Borough of Westchester. Of these, Thomas and Van Cortlandt were of the minority of the Assembly, of which mention has been made; and Philipse and Wilkins

[1] "The Ministry alledged that the Congress was no legal body, and "none could be heard in reference to their proceedings, without giving "that illegal body some degree of countenance; that they could only "hear the Colonies through their legal Assemblies and their Agents properly authorized by them, and properly admitted here; that to do "otherwise would lead to inextricable confusion and destroy the whole "order of Colony Government."—(*Annual Register for the year* 1775, 56.) See, also, *Parliamentary Register* (Almon's) i., 115, 116, 124.

[2] There is no subject connected with the history of the United States which, from the beginning until now, has been more systematically and recklessly falsified than the political character of the members of that Assembly, the influences which controlled that body, and the action which it took, on the great political questions of the day.

Notwithstanding there was not a member of the party of the Government in the Assembly, Murray (*Impartial History*, i., 434) Lossing (*Field Book*, ii., 793) and, with his characteristic indirectness and malignity Bancroft (*History of the United States*, original edition, iv., 208, 209, 210, 211, 212, etc.; *the same*, centenary edition, iv., 455, 456, 457, etc.) stated or insinuated that the "friends of the Government," or "the Tories," were in the ascendency and controlled it.

Notwithstanding the Despatches of Lieutenant-governor Colden to the Home Government, which are (and have been, since 1775) accessible to everybody, abundantly prove that the Colonial Government possessed no more influence, which it could exercise over the Assembly, than was possessed by any other political opponent,—that, in fact, that body was not in harmony with the Government, and acted adversely to the hopes of the Government—Murray, (*Impartial History*, i., 434) *History of Civil War in America*, Dublin: 1779, i., 68; Soule, (*Histoire des Troubles*, i., 125;) etc., assert that whatever action was taken by the House, was under the influence of the Lieutenant-governor of the Colony.

The action, on the great questions of the day, which the Assembly took, from day to day, tells its own story, wherever it is known, and stamps the brand of infidelity to their duties, as historians, on by far the greater number of those who have undertaken to discharge those duties, on these particular subjects.

were of the majority of that body, which has been already described; and because of the prominent parts which those Representatives of that County respectively took, in the debates concerning the momentous questions which were considered and determined in that Assembly, and because of the ills which befell three of those Representatives, because of what they had respectively said and done in that Assembly, there is no portion of the history of revolutionary New York which possesses a deeper interest to those who are of the Westchester-county of more recent days, than that which relates to the action taken by that General Assembly of the Colony of New York, on the political grievances under which the Colony was then said to have been laboring, on the Colonial policy of the Home Government through which those alleged grievances had been inflicted on the Colonies, on the means which were best adapted to the redress of those alleged grievances, and on its employment of those means for that purpose.

Although the Assembly had been prorogued to meet on the tenth of January, 1775, the members from the distant Counties were not present on that day, nor on several succeeding days; and, on the twentieth of that month, a "Call of the House" was ordered to be made on the seventh of February ensuing; and the Clerk of the House was ordered to write to the absent Members, to require their punctual attendance on that day,[1] both factions of the House evidently understanding that that particular "Call of "the House" carried with it, in honor if in nothing else, the additional provision that no leading question which was likely to be brought before the Assembly, during that Session, should be thus introduced, until after that "Call" should have been made, agreeably to that Order.[2] It appears, however, that the minority was strengthened by the arrival of two of the absentees, within a few days after the "Call" had been ordered and nearly a fortnight before the day on which it was ordered to be made—at which time, too, it appeared to the minority that it had temporarily acquired the control of the House—and the majority was surprised, on the twenty-sixth of January, by the introduction of a Resolution, submitted by Colonel Abraham Ten Broeck, of the Manor of Rensselaerwyck, to "take into consideration the Proceed-"ings of the Continental Congress, held in the City "of Philadelphia, in the Months of September and "October last."

Under any circumstances and in any assemblage, there would be aroused an earnest, if not an angry, opposition to any movement which was covered with as much of bad faith and dishonor as was seen, surrounding the Resolution which Colonel Ten Broeck had thus submitted in violation of the honorable understanding, between the two factions, which had been entered into when the "Call of the House" was agreed to, by both; and, in the instance under consideration, "a warm debate ensued," between the rival factions of the Assembly, which was followed by a call "for the Previous Question," submitted by Colonel Philipse, of the County of Westchester, on which, agreeably to the parliamentary usage of that period, the House was carried from the consideration of the Resolution which was then before it, to the consideration of that "previous question," whether the question on the original Resolution should then be taken, in other words, if that original Resolution should not, then and there, be absolutely rejected, without being permitted to linger until another day, in the hands of an adverse majority. By a vote of ten to eleven, the House determined that the question on Colonel Ten Broeck's ill-timed Resolution should not "be now put," thereby entirely defeating the minority, in its certainly dishonorable attempt to force a consideration of the proceedings of the Congress, on the Assembly, in open violation of its own particular undertaking, and at the expense of its own honor.[3]

Very reasonably, although the welcome act was done by those who were not of the "friends of the "Government," the result of that early struggle in the General Assembly of the Colony, on such a momentous question, was very acceptable to the Colonial Government[4] as well as to the Ministry, at London;[5] and, from that date until this, separated from the motives of the majority of the Assembly who had thus rejected the Resolution, and from the other acts of the series, in opposition to the Government, of which

[1] *Journal of the House*, "Die Veneris, 10 ho., A.M., the 20th January, "1775."

[2] "It was some Days before a sufficient number of Members got to Town "to make a House, and there are still twelve of their number absent, "which has occasioned the House to put off the farther consideration of "their Important Business to the 7th of next Month, at which Time "they have ordered all their Members to attend."—(*Lieutenant-governor Colden to the Earl of Dartmouth*, "NEW YORK, 21 January, 1775.")

In the Lieutenant-governor's Despatch to the Earl of Dartmouth, dated on the first of February, 1775, it is stated that the Call of the House referred to was made on a Motion offered by the minority of the House, for what was supposed would be beneficial to its purposes; and when it is remembered that the majority already possessed the control of whatever was brought forward, it will be seen that that majority not only had no occasion to make such a Call, but also, that, when it consented that such a "Call" should be made, it had entire confidence in its control supremacy, even when the entire strength of each of the two factions should have been brought into the House, an instance of its temerity which, very nearly, became disastrous to it.

[3] *Journal of the House*, "Die Jovis, 10 ho., A.M., the 26th January, "1775;" *Lieutenant-governor Colden to General Gage*, "NEW YORK 29th "Jany 1775;" *the same to the Earl of Dartmouth*, "NEW YORK 1st Feby "1775;" *the same to Governor Ergon*, "NEW YORK, 1st Feby, 1775;" *the same to Admiral Graves*, "NEW YORK 20th Feb. 1775."

[4] The venerable Lieutenant-governor of the Province was evidently in excellent spirits, from that result, when he wrote the Despatches to General Gage and the Earl of Dartmouth, which were referred to in the last preceding Note.

[5] "When the question to adopt the Measures recommended by the Con-"gress was negatived by a Majority of one only, in this Assembly of "twenty-six Individuals, the Ministers were in high spirits; and these "Individuals were then represented as 'all America.'"—(Governor Johnstone's *Speech in the House of Commons*, May 15, 1775—Almon's *Parliamentary Register*, i., 473.)

that rejection of Colonel Ten Broeck's Resolution was only the prelude, that Vote of the Assembly has supplied a theme on which those who have seemed to play the part of historians of that portion of America's history, have based much of what they have said, unduly commendatory of Massachusetts and Virginia and quite as unduly denunciatory of everything which pertained to New York, unless of some of the men of New York, of that early period, whose characters, for fidelity to the truth and uprightness in the discharge of public duties, were no better than their own.[1]

The lesson which the defeat of its dishonorable movement, under Colonel Ten Broeck, had given to the minority of the Assembly, appears to have been well-studied by those who were of that minority; but it did not prevent it from continuing to hanker after the leadership of whatever movement, in the direction of a redress of the grievances of the Colonies, the Assembly should be inclined to take. Subsequent events very clearly indicated, indeed, that the minority desired to promote its own factional interests rather than to serve the Colony; and, undoubtedly with that end in view, five days after the defeat of its first ill-timed movement, and apparently actuated only by purely patriotic motives, Peter R. Livingston, of the Manor of Livingston, one of the leaders of the minority, offered a Resolution "that a day "may be appointed to take the state of this Colony "into consideration: to enter such Resolutions as the "House may agree to, on their *Journals;* and, in "consequence of such Resolutions, to prepare a humble, firm, dutiful, and loyal *Petition to our most gracious Sovereign.*" Whatever may have been the purposes of the minority, in submitting that Resolution, however, it certainly gathered no special advantages to itself, in doing so, since the majority promptly accepted a proposition which was perfectly agreeable to it, and added importance to it, *per se*, by uniting with the minority in support of it, all the members who were present, the conservative as well as the radical, uniting in the unanimous adoption of it.[2]

Immediately after the adoption of the Resolution submitted by the Representative of the Livingston Manor, James De Lancey, of the City of New York, one of the leaders of the majority and the head of that powerful family, moved "that a *Memorial to the Lords*, and a *Representation "and Remonstrance to the Commons of Great Brit-"ain* may be prepared, together with the *Petition "to his Majesty;*"[3] and, like the Resolution which

[1] Gordon (*History of American Revolution*, i., 471) led off, in the work of detraction, by saying "The Massachusetts Congress were displeased with "the proceedings of the General Assembly of New York," for this Vote, among others, as if the approval of any merely insurrectionary body were necessary to ensure the respectability, in history, of any General Assembly, legally elected, legally convened, and acting in conformity with law. Ramsay (*History of the American Revolution*, i., 143) insinuated, in the absence of sufficient authority to assert, that "the party for "Royal Government,"—although there was not a member of that party within the Assembly, and although the Colonial Government was confessedly without influence enough to be made acquainted with its intentions—led the Assembly to reject the Resolution. Grahame (*History of the United States*, iv., 360 following Ramsey, and, generally, in his *uncredited* words, repeated the slander which that early writer insinuated. Leake (*Memoir of General Lamb*, 97) regarded the Vote as unpatriotic and "an important ministerial triumph." Lossing (*Field Book of the Revolution*, ii., 793) made "fifteen of the twenty-four Members of the As-"sembly, Loyalists;" and he attributed the Vote to that unduly assumed cause, although, in fact, every member professed to have been equally loyal to the Sovereign. Bancroft, also, as far as his fragmentary paragraphs may be regarded as history (*History of the United States*, original edition, iv., 207–210; *the same*, centenary edition, iv., 454–456) insinuated what he would have been glad to have asserted, had he possessed even a shadow of evidence to support him, that it was the influence of the Government and that of the Established Church, the venality of the Representatives in the Assembly, the timidity of the Colonists themselves, and prejudice against lawyers and Presbyterians, combined, which produced that notable Vote. The servility of the Assembly to the Ministry, singularly enough, produced it, if the acute and untrustworthy John C. Hamilton (*History of the Republic*, i., 79), is to be believed. Lodge (*History of the English Colonies*, 491, one of the latest specimens of Massachusetts dilettanteism, sneeringly refers to the Assembly of New York as "the close corporation known as the Assembly," as if the General Court of Massachusetts, locked in its Chamber, was not quite as "close" a body, while it was in session, as even he could find. Others, including Frothingham (*Rise of the Republic*, 508) told only of the rejection of Colonel Ten Broeck's Resolution, and, by the suppression of much of the truth concerning the subject, left their less informed readers to infer, if the latter are not directly told so, that the Assembly was influenced, in that action, by an antagonism to the popular cause.

No one, unacquainted with the facts and depending on any of the above-named historians for information, can possibly learn, from them, that the Vote referred to was taken in the interest of the common cause, as a prelude to what the Assembly intended to do, in its own manner, in support of that cause; that there was not a "friend of the Government," or "Tory," or member of the "party of the Government," among the members of that Assembly; that the Colonial Government was not consulted, respecting anything which was done, or to be done, by that Assembly; and that not even the Congress of the Continent, as will be seen hereafter, more earnestly, more powerfully, or more successfully opposed the Ministry and demanded a redress of the grievances of the Colonies, than that Assembly, in every thing which it did, on those subjects. Pitkin (*History of the United States*, i., 324, 325,) and Hildreth (*History of the United States*, First Series, iii., 56,) notwithstanding they were New Englanders, did not permit the truth to be suppressed; but they gave to the Assembly of New York, at least a portion of what was due to it, in honestly written history.

[2] *Journal of the House*, "Die Martis, 10 ho., A.M., the 31st January, "1775."

[3] The peculiar force, if not the peculiar assertion of the political standing of the General Assembly, with which the proposed papers were vested, in the words of the Resolution, was noticed, in the Parliament, and used as one of the reasons for the Parliament's rejection of them—in the House of Lords, it was said, "the title of the paper rendered it "inadmissible. It was called 'a *Memorial*:' now, '*Memorials*' are pre-"sented from one crowned head to another; but as to a '*Memorial*' from "an American Assembly, it was unheard of, and ought not to be read." In the same debate, it was said, also, by another Peer, that "the title "given to the paper was suspicious: a '*Petition*' from the same Assem-"bly had been presented to the King, the Colonies not denying the "supreme Rights of His Majesty; a '*Remonstrance*' to the Commons; "and, now, a '*Memorial*' to the Lords. They dropped the usual word "'*Petition*,' lest, from that, it should be imagined that they acknowl-"edged the supreme power of those branches of the Legislature."—(*Speeches of the Earl of Denbigh and Earl Gower, in the House of Lords*, May 18, 1775.)

In the House of Commons, Mr. Jenkinson, in opposition to receiving the paper addressed to that House, "urged that the House had never re-"ceived Petitions of this nature: that, here, the name of a Petition was "studiously avoided, lest anything like an obedience to Parliament "should be acknowledged. The opposition of the Colonies was not so "much against the tax which gave rise to the present dispute, as to the "whole legislative authority of Parliament, and to any restrictions of

had immediately preceded it, that Resolution, also, received the affirmative vote of every member of the House who was then present.[1]

Continuing the commendable work in which it had thus commenced the proceedings of the day, and apparently without any dissent from any one, the House then ordered that James De Lancey, and Benjamin Kissam, of the City of New York, Colonel Philip Schuyler, of Albany-county, George Clinton, of Ulster-county, Dirk Brinkerhoof, of Duchess-county, Samuel Gale, of Orange-county, Isaac Wilkins, of the Borough of Westchester, Crean Brush, of Cumberland-county [*now a part of Vermont*], Christopher Billop, of Richmond-county, John Rapelje, of Kings-county, and William Nicoll, of Queens-county, or the major part of them—all, except Philip Schuyler and George Clinton being of the majority of the House—be "a Committee to prepare *a State*[2] *of the* "*Grievances of this Colony*, and report same to this "House, with all convenient speed, after the Call "thereof, to be had on the seventh of February "next."[3] Having thus indicated what the House proposed to do, in the common cause in which the body of the Colonists was so earnestly engaged, the House was then adjourned.

Time, very often, produces marvellous changes in the tempers and purposes of politicians, especially in those of politicians who are not of the controlling majority, in their own party or in the State; and, very often, the actions of those politicians, when the latter are engaged in a personal, or factional, or partisan struggle, cannot be brought within the provisions of any known rule of action, of any class. No reasonable reason which would be honorable to the minority of the Assembly, therefore, can be given for the eagerness which it displayed, on the sixteenth of February, to disturb the harmony of that body, in which all of both factions appeared to have been united in both purpose and action; but, on that day, Colonel Philip Schuyler, of Albany-county, in behalf of that minority, renewed the conflict of factions which had been opened, unsuccessfully, by Colonel Abraham Ten Broeck, of the Manor of Rensselaerswyck, on the preceding twenty-sixth of January. For that unseemly purpose, that distinguished member of the minority, on the day referred to, moved that certain specified letters, written by the Assembly's Committee of Correspondence, during the recess of the House, and urging the convention of a Congress of the Continent for the consideration of the grievances of the Colonies,[4] should be entered on the *Journals of the House*, and copies of them be sent to the newspapers, for publication; and, of course, "debates arose upon the said Motion," which was followed by the emphatic rejection of it, by a vote of nine, in the affirmative, against sixteen, in the negative—Judge Thomas and Pierre Van Cortlandt, of course, being among the former, and Colonel Philipse and Isaac Wilkins, of course, among the latter.[5]

On the following day, [*February* 17], Colonel Nathaniel Woodhull, of Suffolk-county, also a prominent member of the minority, continued the factional strife, by offering a Resolution of Thanks to those gentlemen who had represented this Colony in the recent Congress, "for their faithful and judicious dis-"charge of the trust reposed in them, by the good "people of this Colony;" and, of course, "debates "arose upon the said Motion;" after which, by a vote of nine, in the affirmative, against fifteen, in the negative, it was rejected—Judge Thomas being among the former, and Colonel Philipse and Isaac Wilkins being among the latter.[6]

On the twenty-first of February, Peter R. Livingston, of the Manor of Livingston, continued the struggle of the minority, by offering a Resolution giving "the Thanks of this House to the Merchants "and Inhabitants of this City and Colony, for their "repeated, disinterested, publick-spirited, and patri-"otic Conduct, in declining the Importation or Re-"ceiving of Goods from Great Britain, and for their "firm Adherence to the *Association* entered into and "recommended by the Grand Continental Congress, "held at Philadelphia, in the Months of September "and October last, and that Mr. Speaker signify the "same to the President of the Chamber of Commerce "in this City, at their next Meeting, and order a copy "of the same to be published in the public Prints." Like the other Resolutions of the series, which had preceded it, this peculiarly inappropriate Resolution, before such a deliberative body, after it had been amply discussed, was promptly rejected by a vote of ten, in the affirmative, among whom were Judge Thomas and Pierre Van Cortlandt, against fifteen,

"their trade."—(*Speech of Mr. Jenkinson, in the House of Commons*, May 15, 1775.—Almon's *Parliamentary Register*, i., 470.)

Besides the peculiarity of the titles of those several papers, to which reference has been made there was a grave significance in the fact that they were moved for, with those titles, by the head of the leading family in the Colony; and that they were ordered by an unanimous vote of the Assembly. It has suited those who have preferred to traduce New York and her General Assembly, however, to regard both the General Assembly and its papers as only favorable to the Home Government and antagonistic to the common cause.

[1] *Journal of the House*, "Die Martis, 10 ho., A.M., the 31st January, "1775."

[2] In the language of that period, the word "State," as it was used in this and similar connections, was the equivalent of the word "State-"ment," which, in such connections, is now employed.

[3] *Journal of the House*, "Die Martis, 10 ho., A.M., the 31st January, "1775."

[4] One of those letters, if not more of them, was noticed in our statement of the measures of the Committee of Correspondence in New York, relative to its proposition for the convention of a Congress of the Colonies, page 23, *ante*.

[5] *Journal of the House*, "Die Jovis, 10 ho., A.M., the 16th February, "1775."

[6] *Journal of the House*, "Die Veneris, 10 ho., A.M., the 17th February, "1775;" *Lieutenant-governor Colden to General Gage*, "NEW YORK 20th "Febry, 1775."

See, also, Dunlap's *History of New-York*, i., 454, 455.

in the negative, among whom were Colonel Philipse and Isaac Wilkins.[1]

On the twenty third of February, Crean Brush, of Cumberland-county, from the Committee which had been appointed to prepare a *State of the Grievances of this Colony*, presented a Report from that Committee; which was "referred to the consideration of a Com-"mittee of the Whole House, and be proceeded on, "by the said Committee, on Wednesday next."[2]

Immediately after the Report on the Grievances of the Colony had been thus referred, Judge John Thomas, one of the Representatives of Westchester-county, and a leading member of the minority, offered a Resolution providing that "the sense of this House "be taken on the necessity of appointing Delegates "for this Colony, to meet the Delegates for the other "Colonies on this Continent, in General Congress, "on the tenth day of May next." The introduction of that resolution led to a spirited Debate in which the motives of the rival factions composing the confederated party of the Opposition and the undue assumption of authority which had not been delegated to it, by the recently held Congress of the Continent, were freely and ably discussed by Colonel Philip Schuyler and George Clinton, in support of the Resolution, and by Crean Brush and Isaac Wilkins,[3] in opposition to it; and the consideration of the subject was closed by the rejection of the Resolution, by a vote of nine in the affirmative and seventeen in the negative, the four Representatives from the County of Westchester being divided between the two factions, as they had been in the previous divisions of the House.[4]

The well-considered and, under the circumstances, the judicious determination of the majority of the General Assembly, to unite in the general opposition to the Colonial policy of the Home Government, in the general demand for a redress of the assumed grievances of the Colonies, and in the generally expressed desire to restore the harmony between the Colonies and the Mother Country, which the infliction of those grievances had disturbed, without, however, recognizing the existence of any other opposition thereto, in any other person, in any other organization, or in any other line of action, in New York or elsewhere, in order that its particular opposition might not encounter that reasonable disregard of the Home Government which the opposition of those who were in open insurrection would surely encounter, was as well known to the minority of that General Assembly, especially after the rejection of the Resolution offered by Colonel Ten Broeck and the subsequent adoption of those offered, respectively, by Peter R. Livingston and James De Lancey, as it was to the greater number of the members of that body, who sustained it; and a decent respect for the welfare of the Colony, that great end which all professed to regard as greater than all others, if that profession had been honestly made, would, unquestionably, have induced every member of each of the factions to have labored, earnestly and harmoniously, in the sincere promotion of the common cause. But it was clearly shown that "the common cause," which was so loudly talked of, was only a secondary matter; that personal and factional interests were, in fact, regarded as superior to the interests of the country; that it was the purpose of the minority and of those with whom it affiliated, for the especial advancement of their individual and factional interests, to obtain the entire control of the political affairs of the Colony, even at the expense of a revolutionary overthrow of the entire structure of the Colonial Government; that, for the promotion of that purpose, the series of Resolutions submitted by the minority, from that submitted by Colonel Schuyler to that submitted by Judge Thomas, was prepared and submitted with an entire knowledge that it would be promptly rejected by the House, as inconsistent with the line of action which the majority had adopted, for its guidance; and that the successive votes of the General Assembly, by which those Resolutions were successively rejected, divested of all that was so well known of the purposes of that body and surrounded with all of insinuation and falsehood which individual animosity and factional zeal could contrive, were industriously presented, one after another, in their naked form, to the populace in New York City and elsewhere, as evidences, as false as they were mischievous, of what was unduly assumed to have been the antagonism of the General Assembly to the common cause, and, at the same time, for the purpose of gradually undermining the affection for the Mother Country, which generally prevailed, throughout the Colony, and of preparing the populace for a revolutionary transfer of the legislative, as well as for that of the executive and judicial, authority of the Colonial Government, into other channels, in the interest of Rebellion, wherein the control would be assumed by other, if not by better, men.

Having fully accomplished its preliminary purpose, in securing from the legally constituted Legislature of the Colony a rejection of the several revolutionary Resolutions which it had submitted, and in, thereby,

---

[1] *Journal of the House*, "Die Martis, 10 ho., A.M., the 21st February, "1775;" *Lieutenant-Governor Colden to General Gage*, "NEW YORK 20th "Febry, 1775."

[2] *Journal of the House*, "Die Jovis, 10 ho., A.M., the 23d February, "1775." *Lieutenant-governor Colden to General Gage*, "NEW YORK, 20th "Febry 1775;" *the same to the Earl of Dartmouth*, "NEW YORK, 1st March, "1775."

[3] Speeches, made by Brush and Wilkins, on that occasion, may be seen in Force's *American Archives*, Fourth Series, i., 1290–1297, the former re-printed from *Rivington's New-York Gazetteer*, No. 98, NEW-YORK, Thursday, March 2, 1775; the latter from the same paper, No. 103, NEW-YORK, Thursday, April 6, 1775. Students of the history of the Revolution in the Colonies will be well paid for the time occupied in a careful perusal of those Speeches, in connection with the other literature of that subject, published during that period.

[4] *Journal of the House*, "Die Jovis, 10 ho., A.M., the 23d of February, "1775;" *Lieutenant-governor Colden to the Earl of Dartmouth*, "NEW YORK, "1st March, 1775."

affording a pretext to those of its confederates, not of the General Assembly, for the assumption, by them, of authority, nominally in the name of the body of the Colonists but really in known opposition to the inclinations of by far the greater number, to call a Convention of the Colony, in the interests of Rebellion, in which should be reposed the uncontrolled power of exercising the various functions of an independent, despotic Government, without any limitation, and in open disregard of the existing, legally-constituted Government of the Colony—having accomplished that preliminary purpose, the minority of the Assembly discontinued the submission of Resolutions of any character; and, as will be seen, all its labors were subsequently devoted to the promotion of its factional purposes, only, in the consideration of the papers which the House had ordered to be prepared and laid before it, in which, however, the majority afforded very slight reasons for complaint.

On the appointed day, [*March* 1, 1775] the Assembly, in Committee of the Whole House, Colonel Benjamin Seaman, of Richmond-county, occupying the Chair, commenced the consideration of the *State of the Colony's Grievances*, which had been reported by the Special Committee which had prepared it;[1] and after having spent the entire day thereon, as well as the whole of the following day[2] and the greater portion of the succeeding day,[3] also, in Committee of the Whole House, the latter day's session was closed by the adoption of the Report, by the Assembly, with a single Amendment, which was submitted by Colonel Philip Schuyler, and supported by nine of the minority, and five of the majority—the only Amendment which was submitted by any-one—a marked feature of the proceedings having been that the amended *State of the Grievances of this Colony* was adopted by the House, without a division.[1]

The *State of Grievances* which was thus adopted by the General Assembly of New York included not only all those Acts of the Parliament of Great Britain, relating to or affecting the Colony of New York, for which Colony only the Assembly presumed to legislate, which the Congress of the Continent had included in the *Bill of Rights and Grievances* which that body had adopted and published, but it included the additional Grievance inflicted in the Act of 6th George III., Chapter XII., "declaring the Right of "Parliament to bind the Colonies in all cases what-"soever," and that inflicted in the Act of 35th Henry VIII., Chapter II., authorizing the removal of prisoners accused of Crimes committed in America, to England, for Trial, neither of which was included in that *Bill of Rights and Grievances* which the Congress had published. It included, also, the Act of 7th George III., Chapter LIX., "requiring the Legisla-"ture of this Colony to provide for the Services there-"in mentioned, without application made to the "Representatives of the People of this Colony, in "General Assembly, and holding up, by any other "Acts, a Suspension of the legislative powers of this "Colony, until such Requisitions be complied with;" the Act of 14th George III. Chapter LXXXIII., "so "far as it may be construed to establish the Roman "Catholic Religion in the Province of Quebec," and "so far as it imposes Duties upon certain Ar-"ticles of Merchandise imported into that Province," "which by another Statute of the same year, Chapter "LXXXVIII., is so extended as to comprehend all the "Indian Country, from Hudson's Bay to the Mouth "of the Ohio-river;" and the four Acts especially relating to Boston and the Colony of Massachusetts-Bay, all of which it declared to be Grievances of this Colony;[5] and, as has been said, it concurred in that

[1] *Journal of the House*, "Die Mercurij, 10 ho., A.M., the 1st March, 1775."

[2] *Journal of the House*, "Die Jovis, 10 ho., A.M., the 2d March, 1775."

[3] *Journal of the House*, "Die Veneris, 10 ho., A.M., the 3d March, "1775."

[4] With that lack of modesty and truthfulness which characterized all, concerning his own family, which John C. Hamilton wrote, that gentleman (*History of the Republic*, i., 81, 82) has undertaken to glorify Colonel Schuyler, his grandfather, by falsifying the record, concerning this *State of Grievances*.

In the Committee which had been appointed for the preparation of the *State*, in which every member brought forward whatever he regarded as a Grievance, and not in the body of the Assembly, as is meanly insinuated, Colonel Schuyler introduced the Act of 4th George III., Chapter XV., as such a Grievance, which was approved and accepted by the Committee, with only two dissenting votes, notwithstanding the overwhelming majority, in that Committee, who was opposed to Colonel Schuyler. When the Report was considered in Committee of the Whole House, there was not the slightest opposition to it; and when the Committee of the House reported the completed paper to the House, John C. Hamilton to the contrary notwithstanding, the entire *State* was adopted without a division.

He also alluded to the third of the Grievances, offered in the original Committee, by James De Lancey, recognizing the Right of the Government of Great Britain to regulate the Trade of the Colonies and to levy Duties on such articles, the products of foreign Nations, as should be imported, directly, into the Colonies—the same, in substance if not in words, as that, on the same subject, which the Congress of the Continent had recently adopted—and he glorified his grandfather, because of that gentleman's labors in opposing it, and in endeavoring to qualify the Assembly's recognition of that Right, through an Amendment, which the Committee had rejected; without, however, alluding to that other fact that, in all that his grandfather did, on that occasion, he did in open antagonism to the action of the Continental Congress, on the same subject—he does not say, also, that all that which has been described was done in the original Committee; that when the Report of the Committee was submitted to the Committee of the Whole House, that larger body reversed the action of the original Committee, and united with Colonel Schuyler and his associates in the minority, in their qualification of that portion of the proceedings of the Continental Congress; nor that the House itself, when it accepted the completed *State*, endorsed and approved that emphatic repudiation of James Duane, and of John Adams, and of their unqualified recognition of the Right of the Mother Country to regulate the Trade of the Colonies and to receive the benefits of that Commerce.

Philip Schuyler needed no such fictitious praise, even from his grandson; and, although he was willing to promote the interests of his faction, he does not appear to have been thus employed, in what he did as a member of that Committee for preparing a *State of the Grievances of this Colony*, nor in any proceedings thereon, either in Committee of the Whole House or in the Assembly.

[5] "I was informd that the Boston and Quebec Bills were at first re-"jected in the Committee as not being Part of the Grievances of this "Colony; it seems however they were at last brought into the Report, "and I am affraid may not now be got rid of in the House."—(*Lieuten.*

action of the Continental Congress, moved by James Duane and supported by John Adams, and nearly in its words,[1] recognizing the Right of the Parliament "to regulate the Trade of the Colonies, and to lay "Duties on articles that are imported, directly, into "this Colony, from any foreign Country or Planta-"tation, which may interfere with the Products or "Manufactures of Great Britain or any other parts of "His Majesty's Dominions," qualified however, by "excluding every idea of Taxation, internal or exter-"nal, for the purpose of raising a Revenue on the "Subjects in America, without their Consent." It will be seen, therefore, that the *State of the Grievances of this Colony*, adopted and published by the General Assembly, was more extended than the *Bill of Rights and Grievances* which the Congress of the Colonies had adopted and published; and it will be seen, also, by any one who will compare the two papers, that the former, both in its tone and in its terms, was quite as firm and quite as plain spoken, on the several subjects to which it was devoted, as was the latter; and that, in the adoption and promulgation of that *State*, the majority of the Assembly openly maintained its character and standing, as intelligent and fearless opponents of the Colonial policy of the Home Government, without impairing its consistency as Members of the Legislature of a Colony—even the factional confederates of the minority, out in the populace, because of that Act, was compelled to acknowledge the fidelity of the majority, and to admit, in their correspondence with each other, that the *State of the Grievances in this Colony* which it had prepared and promulgated, was an accurate exposition of the feelings and opinions of the great body of the Colonists, in New York, wherever any feelings or opinions, on those subjects, really existed, concerning their grievances, and altogether favorable to the common cause.[2]

On the seventh of March, James De Lancey, and Benjamin Kissam, of New York City, and George Clinton, of Ulster-county, were appointed a Committee to prepare the series of Resolutions required as a basis for the *Petition to the King*, which had been ordered by the House, on the thirty-first of January preceding;[3] and, on the following day, Benjamin Kissam reported, from that Committee, a series of Resolutions, agreeably to that Order. The Assembly promptly went into a Committee of the Whole House, with Colonel Benjamin Seaman, of Richmond-county, in the Chair; and proceeded to consider the Report which had thus been presented; and, after having made some amendments in the proposed Resolutions,[4] the Chairman reported the result of the Committee's deliberations to the House; and, after some discussion, the House agreed with the Committee, in its Report and Resolutions.[5]

The first of these Resolutions, following the general sentiment of the Colonists, acknowledged the Faith and Allegiance to the King which were due to him from "the people of this Colony." The second acknowledged that the Colonists "owe obedience to all "Acts of Parliaments calculated for the general weal "of the whole Empire and the due regulation of the "Trade and Commerce thereof, and not inconsistent "with the essential Rights and Liberties of English-"men, to which they are equally entitled with their "fellow-subjects in Great Britain." The third declared "that it is essential to Freedom and the un-"doubted Right of Englishmen, that no Taxes be "imposed on them but with their consent, given per-"sonally or by their Representatives in General As-"sembly." The fourth maintained "that the Acts of "Parliament, raising a Revenue in America especially "to provide for the support of the Civil Government "and administration of Justice in the Colonies, ex-"tending the Jurisdiction of the Courts of Admiralty "beyond their ancient limits, authorizing the Judge's "Certificate to indemnify the Prosecutor from Dam-"ages he would otherwise be liable to, giving them a "concurrent Jurisdiction of Causes heretofore cog-"nizable only in the Courts of Common Law, and by "that means depriving the American Subject of his "Trial by a Jury, are destructive to Freedom, and "subversive of the Rights and Liberties of the Colo-"nies." The fifth and last of these Resolutions declared "that a Trial by a Jury of the Vicinage, in all "Capital Cases, is the grand Security of Freedom and "the Birthright of Englishmen; and, therefore, that "the seizing any Person or Persons, residing in this "Colony, suspected of Treasons, Misprisions of "Treason, or any other Offences, and sending such "Person or Persons out of the same, to be tried, is dan-"gerous to the Lives and Liberties of His Majesty's "American Subjects."[6]

The politicians of New York, those of later as well

ant-governor Colden to the Earl of Dartmouth, "NEW YORK, 1st March, "1775,").

[1] Bancroft's *History of the United States*, original edition, vii., 139, 140; *the same*, centenary edition, iv., 401, 402.

[2] In a letter written by Alexander McDougal, the well-known popular leader, addressed to Josiah Quincy, Junior, then in London, and dated "NEW-YORK, April 6, 1775," the student of the history of the Revolution, in New York, may find much, relating to the opinions of the revolutionary elements in that Colony, concerning this *State*, as well as concerning other kindred subjects.

[3] *Journal of the House*, "Die Martis, 10 ho., A.M., the 7th March, "1775."

[4] As the action of the Committee which resulted in those Amendments was not generally noticed on the *Journal* or in the *Report*, it is very evident that they were, generally, only verbal corrections, unimportant in character, and involving no distinguishing principles. But there were two amendments, proposed by Colonel Nathaniel Woodhull and George Clinton respectively, which were rejected, although the the motions for amendment were supported, in each instance, by several members of the majority, as well as by the full force of the minority; but because the principle involved in each of the proposed Amendments was distinctly declared in another of the Resolutions, the rejection of the proposition to repeat it, possessed no political significance whatever.

[5] *Journal of the House*, "Die Mercurii, 10 ho., A.M., the 8th March, "1775."

[6] *Ibid.*

those of earlier periods, have always been unlike those of any other Colony, or State, or Country; and in the matter of these declaratory Resolutions, the spirit and terms of which were quite as radical in their character as could have been desired by the most advanced republican who was not an anarchist, the well-established reputation of those politicians was amply sustained—every member of the majority of the Assembly, including James DeLancey, John Cruger, Benjamin Kissam, Crean Brush, Isaac Wilkins, and Frederic Philipse, except John Coe, of Orange-county, and Dirck Brinckerhoff, of Duchess-county, voted in favor of the adoption of them and, of course, in favor of the embodiment of their terms in an *Address to the King;* while every member of the minority of the House, with Coe and Brinckerhoff of the majority, voted in opposition to the adoption of them. Factional and partisan bitterness, very often, produces such remarkable instances of the inconsistency, if not of the incomprehensibility, of mere politicians; but history affords few, if any, such examples, among those who were really patriotic, as were afforded by John Thomas and Pierre Van Cortlandt, by Peter R. Livingston and Nathaniel Woodhull, by George Clinton and Philip Schuyler, in the instance under consideration, when they voted against the Resolutions which have been fully described and, consequently, against the great political principles which were asserted and maintained therein, for no other reason which is now discoverable than the peculiar fact that those Resolutions had proceeded from and were, then, supported by the majority of the Assembly, by that faction of the great party of the Opposition of which all were equally members, to which they—those who have been named and those who were with them—did *not* belong.[1]

Whatever may have influenced those who had assumed to be the peculiarly disinterested and sincere supporters of the common cause, in their united vote to reject the Resolutions which are, now, under consideration, those who are of the Westchester-county of the present day will continue to be interested in the fact that, on that very critical occasion, when the eyes of all sober-minded men, in Europe as well as in America, were turned toward that small Assembly-chamber, Isaac Wilkins, of the Borough of Westchester, and Frederic Philipse, representing the body of the County, manfully declared the Rights of the Colonists and those of the Colonies, and bravely resisted what were regarded as the usurpations of the Home Government; while Pierre Van Cortlandt, of the Manor of Cortlandt, and John Thomas, representing the body of the County, quite as manfully opposed them, and, indirectly, quite as bravely denied the existence of those individual and Colonial Rights, and quite as boldly sustained the Home Government, in what it had done, as any open and avowed "friend of the Government" could have done, had one been present,—a lesson of the highest importance to those who shall incline to ascertain the exact truth, concerning the origin of the American Revolution and the purposes of those who promoted it, within the Colony of New York, may be seen in the simple record of this single action of the Representatives of Colonial New York, in her General Assembly, in 1775.

On the day after these Resolutions had been adopted by the Assembly, [*March* 9th,] that body ordered the appointment of "a Committee to prepare and lay "before the House, with all convenient speed, the "Draft of an humble, firm, dutiful, and loyal *Petition*, "to be presented to our most Gracious Sovereign," pursuant to Colonel Peter R. Livingston's Motion on the thirty-first of the preceding January; and William Nicoll, of Suffolk-county, Leonard Van-Kleeck, of Duchess-county, and Isaac Wilkins, of the Borough of Westchester, were appointed the Committee for that purpose. During the same day, Crean Brush, from Cumberland-county, Colonel Benjamin Seaman, of Richmond-county, and Samuel Gale, of Orange-county, were appointed a Committee "to prepare the Draft of a *Memorial to the Lords;*" and Daniel Kissam, of Queens-county, and James De Lancey and Jacob Walton, of the City of New York, were appointed a Committee "to prepare the "Draft of a *Representation and Remonstrance to the* "*Commons of Great Britain*," both of them pursuant to the Resolution offered by James De Lancey, to which reference has been already made.[2] The House directed, also, that the Drafts of those several papers should be laid before it, "with all convenient "speed."[3]

It will be seen that on neither of these Committees was there a single member of the minority of the House, notwithstanding the Resolution on which the first-named of those Committees was appointed originated with a leading member of that faction, and notwithstanding, also, both the Resolutions pursuant to which all the Committees were appointed, had been adopted in the Assembly by an unanimous vote, every member of each of the two factions, in temporary harmony and good-will, having united in approving and supporting them—an evident result of the bitter factional feeling which had been aroused, first by the evidently dishonorable conduct of the minority, in springing upon the Assembly the Resolution which was offered by Colonel Ten Broeck, on the twenty-sixth of January, for taking into consideration the Proceedings of the Congress of the Colonies, while a "Call of the House," asked for by itself and for its

[1] The official record of the votes of the several Members of the Assembly, of both factions of the party of the Opposition, as it may be seen in the *Journal of the House*, is one of the most curious and most unaccountable, within our knowledge.

[2] Vide pages 50, 51, ante.

[3] *Journal of the House*, "Die Jovis, 10 ho., A.M., the 9th of March, "1775."

peculiar advantage, was pending;[1] and, subsequently, by the peculiarly factional proceedings of the minority, in the presentation of Resolution after Resolution, only for the promotion of Revolution; and in its dishonorable opposition, while the Assembly was considering the *State of the Grievances* and the series of declaratory Resolutions, to all of which proceedings reference has been herein made.[2]

On the sixteenth of March, Isaac Wilkins, from the Committee appointed to prepare it, reported "the "Draft of a *Petition to the King;*" and, immediately afterwards, Crean Brush, from the Committee appointed to prepare it, reported "a Draft of a *Memor-"ial to the Lords.*" During the same day, James De Lancey, from the Committee appointed to prepare it, reported "the Draft of a *Representation and Remon-"strance to the Commons of Great Britain;*" and the Assembly promptly referred all those papers, for consideration, to a Committee of the Whole House.[3]

On the twenty-fourth of March, the Assembly resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole House, upon the Draught of a *Petition to the King*, Colonel Benjamin Seaman, of Richmond-county, being in the Chair; and, again, the minority displayed its factional animosity by presenting Amendment after Amendment, by far the greater number of them being merely verbal, without disturbing either the sense or the spirit of the original. In one instance, however, very unaccountably and not very consistently, Colonel Philip Schuyler appeared to have entertained a more than usually tender regard for His Majesty's "prerogative," in the matter of the Paper Currency of the Colony, "in the preservation of which preroga-"tive," he said, "we are deeply interested;" and an Amendment, on that subject, which he submitted, was adopted by the House, without a division. Another Amendment, concerning the Judiciary of the Colony, and entirely cancelling the paragraph, on that subject, which the Committee had reported, was submitted by George Clinton, of Ulster-county, and agreed to, by an unanimous vote of the House; and another Amendment, submitted by Colonel Frederic Philipse, by striking the words "seem to," from one of the paragraphs, and, by doing so, making the Acts relating to Boston and the Colony of Massachusetts-Bay *really* "establish a dangerous precedent, by inflict-"ing Punishment without the formality of a Trial," instead of only *seeming* to do so, as the original paragraph described them, really strengthened the *Petition*, in its assertion of the Grievances to which the Colonies had been subjected.[4] As the records of the closing portion of the proceedings of the Committee of the Whole House and those of all that the House, itself, did, on this subject, "are missing," in our copy of the *Journal*, the details of those proceedings cannot be given;[5] but history bears testimony to the general fact that, in its amended form, the *Petition to the King* was duly agreed to, by the Assembly.[6]

On the same day, [*March 24th*], the *Memorial to the House of Lords* and the *Representation and Remonstrance to the House of Commons*, after several Amendments, none of them possessing any importance whatever and only three of them having called for a division of the House, had been negatived in the Committee of the Whole House, were successively reported to the House; and, in the respective forms in which they were thus reported, the House adopted them, in each instance, without a division of the House.[7]

On the following morning, [*March 25th*] the engrossed copies of the *Petition to the King*,[8] the *Memorial to the Lords*,[9] and the *Representation and Remonstrance to the Commons of Great Britain*[10] were respectively presented to the House, read, and again agreed to, in each case without a division of the House. In each instance, also, the Speaker was ordered to sign the document, in behalf of the House; and, after having ordered the Speaker to transmit these three several petitions to the King, the Lords, and the Commons, "with all convenient speed, to Edmund "Burke, Esquire, Agent of this Colony at the Court "of Great Britain; and that a Letter be prepared, to "be approved by this House, to the said Agent, with "directions that he present the same, in behalf of "this Colony, as they are respectively directed, as "soon after the receipt thereof as possible;" and with the additional *Order* "that Mr. Speaker trans-"mit, at the same time, to the Agent, the *State of the* "*Grievances of this Colony* and the Resolutions of "this House thereupon," the House adjourned.[11]

On the thirty-first of March, the Assembly ordered the Speaker to send to the Speakers of the several Houses of Assembly on this Continent, as soon after

[1] Vide pages 49, 50, ante.

[2] Vide pages 51–53, ante.

[3] *Journal of the House*, "Die Jovis, 10 ho., A.M., the 16th March, "1775."

[4] *Journal of the House*, "Die Veneris, 10 ho., A.M., the 24th March, "1775."

[5] The original *Journals of the Assembly* which included the proceedings of the entire Session which is now under consideration, were lost during the troublesome times of that period; and the only known copy of the original printed edition of those *Journals* wanted four pages, in this portion of it. Those missing pages contained the closing portion of the proceedings of the House, on the *Petition to the King*, as stated in the text, and the opening of its proceedings on the *Memorial to the House of Lords*.

[6] The completed Petition to the King, signed by the Speaker of the Assembly, may be seen in the *Journal of the Assembly*, "Die Sabbati, 10 "ho., A.M., the 25th March 1775."

[7] "*Journal of the House*, "Die Veneris, 10 ho., AM., the 24th March "1775."

The defect in the *Journal*, as it is now known to us, to which reference has been made, leaves us without any information concerning the proceedings of the House on the first twenty paragraphs of the *Memorial to the House of Lords*.

[8] *Journal of the House*, "Die Sabbati, 10 ho., A. M., the 25th March "1775."

[9] *Ibid.*

[10] *Journal of the House*, "Die Sabbati, 4 ho., P.M., the 25th March, "1775."

[11] *Ibid.*

the rise of this House as conveniently may be, copies of the *State of the Grievances*, of the Resolutions of the House, of the *Petition to the King*, of the *Memorial to the Lords*, and of the *Representation and Remonstrance to the Commons*, requesting those several Speakers to lay the same before their respective Houses of Assembly, at their first meeting after the receipt thereof.[1]

On the following day, [*April 1st.*] the Assembly appointed "a Standing Committee of Correspondence," composed of the Speaker, [*John Cruger*,] James De Lancey, James Jauncey, Benjamin Kissam, and Jacob Walton, all of them from the City of New York, Benjamin Seaman, of Richmond-county, Isaac Wilkins, of the Borough of Westchester, Frederic Philipse, of Westchester-county, Zebulon Seaman, of Queens-county, John Rapalje and Simon Boerum, of Kings-county, Samuel Gale, of Orange-county, and George Clinton, of Ulster-county, or any seven of them, "whose duty it shall be to obtain the most "early and authentic intelligence of all such Acts "and Resolutions of the British Parliament or Pro-"ceedings of Administration as do or may relate to "or affect the Liberties and Privileges of His Ma-"jesty's Subjects, in the British Colonies in America "and to keep up and maintain a Correspondence and "Communication with our Sister Colonies, respecting "these important considerations; and the result of "their Proceedings to lay before the House."[2]

On the following Monday, the third of April, the Assembly adjourned until the third of May;[3] and that eventful Session of the last General Assembly of the Colony of New York, which was assembled for the discharge of legislative duties, was ended.

That General Assembly and all that it did, from the opening of the Session until the final declaration of its Speaker brought that Session to a close, have been made the themes of unceasing misrepresentation and abuse or of absolute and contemptuous silence, from far the greater number of those who have assumed to write or to speak concerning the history of that notable period. They have been the themes, sometimes, of ignorant and unscrupulous bigots and, sometimes, of intelligent and unscrupulous tricksters; sometimes a personal and sometimes a local end has been served by either a falsification or a concealment of the truth, concerning them; and, sometimes, fragments of useless and glittering rhetoric, strung together, as farmers string fragments of useless and glittering tin and display them in order to deceive and to scatter unsuspecting birds from their cornfields, in like manner, have been employed by literary prestidigitators, in order to deceive those who are less intelligent than themselves, concerning that Assembly, and its members, and their doings; and, through that deception, to promote their own or their party's or their sectional purposes. Individual members of that Assembly, men of honor and unimpeachable integrity, have been stigmatized as "wretches," and as "the veriest reptiles on earth" and charged with "corruption" and every kindred vice—some of them were driven from their families and their homes; others of them were lawlessly seized and carried from their families and their homes, exiled, and held in lawless bondage; and others of them were stripped of their patrimonial estates or of the estates of their own creation—only because they had preferred, as Members of that Assembly, to assert the Grievances under which the Colony was said to have been laboring and to demand a Redress of those alleged Grievances, not with any less distinctness of words nor with any less firmness of manner, but after a manner and through instrumentalities of their own selection and which possessed their greater confidence, rather than after a manner and through instrumentalities which others would have thrust on them, which their own sense of fitness and adaptability had not approved, which were controlled by men in whose noisy pretensions to personal and political integrity they could not repose confidence. Measures which were sincerely intended for the promotion of the common cause of the Colonies, in their struggle with the Home Government,—measures which presented nothing else than political principles or recitals of facts which no one, of any sect or faction, pretended to dispute—were opposed, vehemently and without measure, within as well as without the Assembly, only because they had not originated and were not supported before the House, by the opposite faction of the Opposition; and, with that hereditary, or sectional, or sectarian, or partisan bitterness which the lapse of years has served only to intensify, that work of depreciation and misrepresentation of those measures and of all who favored them, continues to disgrace much, at the present day, which is audaciously called "history."

A candid and carefully-made comparison of the terms of those several *State of Grievances*, and declaratory Resolutions, and *Petition*, and *Memorial*, and *Representation and Remonstrance*, which were prepared, and agreed to, and presented, and published by that much-abused General Assembly of Colonial New York, with the several Resolutions, and *Declaration of Rights*, and *Association*, and *Addresses*, and *Memorials*, and *Petition*, which, in like manner, were prepared, and agreed to, and presented, and published by the much-eulogized Congress of the Continent, which had assembled in Philadelphia, in September, 1774, will clearly establish the fact that the former were quite as decided, in their tone, and quite as clear and distinct, in their terms, as the latter; and such a comparison will also clearly establish the fact that, in its continuous and violent opposition to the former,

[1] *Journal of the House*, "Die Veneris, 10 ho., A.M., the 31st March, "1775."

[2] *Journal of the House*, "Die Sabbati, 10 ho., A.M., the 1st April, "1775."

[3] *Journal of the House*, "Die Lunæ, 10 ho., A.M., the 3d April, 1775."

in every stage of its progress through the House, the minority of that General Assembly was clearly actuated by some other motive than that of simple, uncontaminated patriotism.

It will be seen, also, by every careful and candid reader of the published proceedings of that Congress to which reference has been made, that, notwithstanding the gravamen of the declared Grievances of the constituent Colonies, of that notable body, consisted of sundry Acts of Parliament, all of which were considered as oppressive, it had made no attempt whatever, either by Petition or otherwise, to induce the Parliament to remove or even to modify those Grievances, or any of them, by a repeal or even by an amendment of the obnoxious provisions of those oppressive legal enactments, contenting itself, instead, with preparing, and agreeing to, and presenting, only *Addresses to the People of Great Britain, to the Inhabitants of the Province of Quebec*, and *to the King*, and a *Memorial to the Inhabitants of the British Colonies*, respectively, not one of whom possessed the slightest legislative authority, nor the slightest ability, in any way, to remove nor even to modify those Grievances, whatever might have been its disposition to have done so—indeed, notwithstanding the well known desires of the great body of the Colonists, throughout the entire Continent, notwithstanding the known purposes for which that Congress had been convened, and notwithstanding the express provisions of the greater number of the Credentials of the several Delegations, the proceedings of that Congress were mainly declaratory and justificatory of Rebellion, with scarcely an effort to obtain a redress of Grievances, and nothing whatever for the yet more desired reconciliation and union with the Mother Country, "so beneficial to the "whole Empire, and so ardently desired by all British "America,"[1] for "the restoration of union and har-"mony between Great Britain and the Colonies, most "ardently desired by all good men."[2] The tone and the tendency of all that it did, however, were peculiarly revolutionary, in all which it was eminently successful;[3] and, to that extent, if no further, it had failed to represent, truly, those in whose name it had nominally acted. On the other hand, the General Assembly of Colonial New York, the legitimacy of whose organization and the entire legality of whose action, in behalf of the common cause, no one has ever presumed to question; without compromising its dignity, as a General Assembly; with that common sense which, in Europe as well as in America, was, then, so peculiarly uncommon; without entangling itself with any questionable alliance; and without belittling its legitimate influence by expressing its official sympathy with any other body, even in relation to those measures which were similar, in character and purpose, to those of its own enactment—that General Assembly, quite as clearly and quite as energetically as the Congress had done, in behalf of its constituents, boldly declared the Grievances of those whom it represented, in a clear recital of the several Acts of Parliament which had been employed by the Home Government for the oppression of the Colonists; and, in addition to that recital of specific Statutes which were grievous in their provisions, it adopted a series of Resolutions, declaratory of the general Rights of the Colonists, as Englishmen, "to which they were "equally entitled with their fellow-subjects in Great "Britain"—Resolutions which no one could have made stronger, in support of the common cause. But, unlike that Congress, and more consistently with its duty to its constituency than anything, in that connection, which the Congress had professed to do, that General Assembly, in its official character, approached the King and the two Houses of Parliament, in whom, acting together, rested the only legitimate authority which could possibly be exercised for the removal of those Grievances which it had described, and for the restoration of that harmony, between the Colonies and the Mother Country, which the former so earnestly desired; and, unto these, respectively, it respectfully presented its manly, and dignified, and legally-expressed prayers for the repeal of those several Acts or parts of Acts which were oppressive or which threatened to become so. In all these, it violated no law and fostered no spirit of disaffection. Without the loss of any of that dignity which legitimately belonged to it, and without sacrificing any of that respect for its constituents which its duty required it to maintain, it recognized the sovereignty of the King, as the Congress had also done; and, consistently with that dignity and that respect, but with a boldness which was peculiarly its own, at the same time, it also asserted its own standing, as a General Assembly, by memorializing instead of petitioning the Peers, and by representing the facts of the usurpation, to the Commons, and by supplementing that "representation" with a "remonstrance" against the action of that distinguished body, in its serious disregard of the Rights of the Colonists. In all these several prayers, with whatever titles and in whatever form they were presented, the General Assembly employed terms which commanded the respect of those to whom they were respectively addressed; and, in one instance, so clearly was the Grievance represented and so earnest was the remonstrance which was made against it, in the Assembly's *Remonstrance*, that even Lord North was obliged to acknowledge the force and the fitness of the plea, and, in his place in the House of Commons,

[1] *Credentials of the Delegation from Virginia, to the Congress.*

[2] *Credentials of the Delegation from Massachusetts, to the Congress.*

[3] It is matter of history, well known to every student, that the action of the Congress on the *Suffolk-county Resolutions*, (*Journal of the Congress*, "Saturday, September 17, 1774, A.M."), closed the door of reconciliation against the Colonies, and led the Home Government to regard the great body of the Colonists as only rebels, against whom it had become the duty of that Government to throw the weight of its authority, a determination for which those Colonists, in their individual relations, had given no warrant, either in their actions or their dispositions.

to declare his willingness that that Grievance, if no other of the series, should be duly removed.

Notwithstanding all that has been said in depreciation of that particular Colonial General Assembly, it did not consider it necessary, nor even expedient, to override the minority of its members without even recognizing their existence on its *Journal*, under cover of the subsequently notorious "unit-rule," in recording the votes of its members, nor in any other manner; nor did it conceal its proceedings, whether honestly or questionably determined, by publishing as complete what were only mutilated copies of its *Journal*, all of which the Congress had done. It might have been charged with "corruption," with some degree of propriety, had it purchased an appearance of unanimity in its votes with unexplained exceptions in the mandatory provisions of some of its general enactments—exceptions in favor of one of the high-contracting parties, which were necessarily conceded as equivalents for commercial trickery in another—as the Congress had done; but the divided votes which are presented on nearly every page of its *Journal* very clearly indicate that, whatever of factional bitterness there might have been, neither codfish nor rice was recognized as an element in the determination of grave questions, affecting the peace of the Colonies and the welfare and happiness of millions, in Europe as well as in America. On the contrary, what it did was done honorably, and openly, and in conformity with the requirements of parliamentary, as well as of constitutional, Law; not by unanimous Votes, actual or fictitious, but by a majority of its members, duly and courteously exercising the authority with which that majority was duly and legally vested. It was not done by the action of the minority of that Assembly, which represented the revolutionary element of the Inhabitants of the City of New York more completely and with greater zeal than it represented those several constituencies who had given seats, in that body, to it; but it was done in the face of that factious minority, and notwithstanding its open, persistent, and resolute opposition. It was not done by reason of any prompting or influence of either the Colonial or the Home Government; but in well-known opposition to the wishes and the expectations of both. It was not done because of any popular influence, present or prospective; but only from the personal knowledge of its members, concerning the great wrongs to which, it was said, the Colonies had been subjected, concerning the rights and the interests of the Colonists which had been invaded, and concerning the measures which were necessary for the protection of those invaded rights and interests, for securing a redress of those great wrongs, and for the restoration of harmony and peace. In fact, that General Assembly, in all the proceedings of which mention has been made, more clearly and more faithfully represented the interests and the opinions and the inclinations, concerning governmental matters, of the aggregate body of the Colonists, in New York, including every class, and sect, and political party—and it possessed no authority to represent any other, and made no pretension to do so—than either the Congress of the Continent or the fragmentary revolutionary faction within the Colony had done or possibly could do; and there is very great reason for the belief that its orderly, and dignified, and more practically sensible influence would have been recognized beyond the limits of New York, and that it would have succeeded in its honorable efforts and evidently earnest purposes to restore, permanently and without dishonor, that harmony between the Colonies and the Mother Country which all professed to desire, had not the rashness of General Gage, in Massachusetts, during the brief recess which it had voted to itself, broken the well-strained barriers of Peace, loosed the worst elements of human nature in the Colonists, overturned everything which pertained to a Government of Law, and plunged the Continent into all the horrors of a needless and, necessarily, a bitter fratricidal War—a War which, at its conclusion, the farmers of Westchester-county, or those of them who remained, more than all New England combined, had sorrowful reasons for remembering, because of the devastated homesteads, the divided families, the antagonistic neighbors, and the remembrance of plunder, and outrages, and butcheries, among them, of which that War had been so abundantly and so sadly productive.

A few words only are required to complete the record of the results of that much-slandered General Assembly; and the space which they will occupy cannot be better occupied.

The Petition which was officially sent to the Agent of the Colony, the celebrated Edmund Burke, for presentation to the King, was duly laid before the Sovereign;[1] but, inasmuch as the General Assembly had, also, addressed the Parliament, on the same subjects, it is not known that any particular attention was paid to it.

On the fifteenth of May, the distinguished Agent of the Colony, offered to be presented to the House of Commons, the *Representation and Remonstrance* which the Colonial General Assembly had addressed to that body; and, in doing so, Mr. Burke made a short Speech, in which he told the House that "they never "had before them so fair an opportunity of putting "an end to the unhappy disputes with the Colonies, "as at present; and he conjured them, in the most

[1] "Mr Burke having delivered to me the Petition to the King, I had "the honour to present it to His Majesty, who was pleased to receive "it with the most gracious expressions of regard and attention to the "humble request of his faithful subjects in New-York, who have, on "this occasion, manifested a duty to His Majesty and a regard for the "authority of the Parent State, which, had they not, in the *Memorial* "*to the House of Lords* and in the *Representation to the House of Commons*, "been unfortunately blended with expressions containing Claims which "made it impossible for Parliament, consistent with its justice and dig-"nity, to receive them, might have laid the foundation of that Recon-"ciliation we have so long and so ardently wished for."—(*The Earl of Dartmouth to Governor Tryon*, "WHITEHALL, May 29, 1775.")

"earnest manner, not to let it escape, as possibly, the "like might never return;" closing his remarks with the statement that "he had, several times in "the Session, expressed his sentiments, very fully, "upon every thing contained in that *Remonstrance;* "as for the rest, it spoke so strongly for itself that he "did not see how people in their senses could refuse "at least the consideration of so reasonable and de-"cent an address;" and, after having "stated the "heads of the *Remonstrance*," "he moved for leave to "bring it up." The Ministry was not as well disposed, however, as Mr. Burke appeared to suppose; and Lord North promptly took the floor, to reply to what that gentleman had said. He commenced by asking the Clerk to read the official record of the proceedings of the House, in December, 1768, on a Petition of the General Assembly of Pennsylvania, and what was known as the *Declaratory Act;* and he continued by saying that he was "greatly in favour of "New York; and that he would gladly do everything "in his power to shew his regard to the good behaviour "of that Colony;" but he declared that the "honour "of Parliament required that no paper should be pre-"sented to that House, which tended to call in ques-"tion the unlimited Rights of Parliament." "As to "the Quebec Duties," which was one of the Grievances against which the General Assembly had remonstrated, he said "he did not pretend to be infal-"lible; he confessed they were not laid as they ought "to be; and he declared that he was willing to give "satisfaction, in that point, immediately." "This, "however," he said, "was but a trifle to the general "objects of the *Remonstrance*." An earnest Debate ensued, Messrs. Cornwall and Jenkinson supporting the Ministry, and Messrs. Cruger, Aubrey, Charles James Fox, and Governor Johnstone supporting Mr. Burke; and that was followed by the submission by Lord North, of an Amendment to Mr. Burke's Motion "for leave to bring up," making it read thus: "That "the said *Representation and Remonstrance* (in which "the said Assembly claim to themselves Rights derog-"atory to, and inconsistent with, the legislative "authority of Parliament, as declared by the *Declara-"tory Act*) be brought up." By a vote of one hundred and eighty-six to sixty-seven, the Amendment was adopted; and the amended Motion, of course, was promptly rejected, without a division.[1]

Three days after that rejection of the *Representation and Remonstrance of the General Assembly*, by the House of Commons, [*May* 18, 1775] the Duke of Manchester brought the *Memorial* which that General Assembly had addressed to the House of Lords, before that House, and moved that it be read. The Earl of Dartmouth opposed the Motion; and a spirited Debate ensued, in which the Earls of Buckinghamshire, Denbigh, Gower, Hillsborough, and Sandwich, and Lord Mansfield, supported the Minister, and the Duke of Richmond, the Earls of Shelburne and Effingham, and Lord Camden, opposed him. The only objection raised against the reading of the *Memorial* was the bare suspicion that "it contained "matter derogatory to the supreme legislative power "of Great Britain;" and on that suspicion, alone, the *Memorial* not having been even described, the House sustained the Minister, and declined to allow the *Memorial* to be read, by a vote of twenty-five to forty-five, sending it, of course, into the legislative limbo.[2] Well might Edmund Burke subsequently say of that rejection of the *Memorial* and of the *Remonstrance* of the General Assembly of Colonial New York, by the two Houses of Parliament, "nothing done in Parlia-"ment seemed to be better calculated to widen the "breach between Great Britain and the Colonies."[3]

[1] Almon's *Parliamentary Register*, ii., 407-473; *Annual Register for* 1775, "History of Europe," 115, *116.

[2] Almon's *Parliamentary Register*, ii., 152-156; *Annual Register for* 1775, "History of Europe," *116, *117.

It is a reasonable case, in such instances as those cited and in those of the earlier historians of the American Revolution who lived and wrote in Europe, that no more than the rejection, by the Parliament, of the two papers which were sent to that legislature by the General Assembly of New York, was mentioned in the writings of those gentlemen; but there is no valid excuse for those, in America, who have exhausted all their resources of misrepresentation and abuse on that General Assembly, charging it with having been everything which was detrimental to the honor or the integrity or the interests of the Colonies, and closing their respective narratives, on the subject of that Assembly, by reciting no more than the facts, stated in the text—that its *Memorial* and *Remonstrance* had been rejected by the two Houses of Parliament, without having been read—without having pretended to explain how it were possible that so bad an Assembly as they had described, could, by any possibility, have been, the author and publisher of such papers as, because of their peculiarly republican averments, the Home Government and the Parliament would not allow to be even read in their presence.

Bancroft, after having consolidated the *Remonstrance* and the *Memorial*, making them one paper, obliged Burke to offer both, on the same day, and in the same House, all of which were described in the narrow compass of four lines, without even a hint how such an Assembly as he had previously described, could have produced such a paper—his silence serving to screen his unfaithfulness, as a historian, both in a falsification and in a suppression of the truth. (*History of the United States*, original edition, iv., 286; *the same*, centenary edition, iv., 515.) John C. Hamilton, of course, by his suppression as well as by his falsification of the truth, in order that his father and his grandfather might be unduly eulogized, is equally untrustworthy (*History of the Republic*, i., 86.) Lendrum, (*History of the American Revolution*, i., 87;) "Paul Allen" (*History of the American Revolution*, i., 237, 238;) Gordon, (*History of the American Revolution*, i., 500;) Ramsay, (*History of the American Revolution*, i., 171, 172;) and others, less prominent but not less popular, have been equally unfaithful, as historians, in this matter.

Lossing, (*Field Book of the Revolution*;) Frothingham, (*Rise of the Republic*;) Bilpath, (*History of the United States*;) Lodge, (*History of the English Colonies in America*;) Morse, (*Annals of the American Revolution*;) Warren, (*History of the American Revolution*;) and others, although abounding in facts and fictions concerning Massachusetts, have not spared a line for the recognition of what was done for "the common "cause," by the General Assembly of the Colony of New York.

Pitkin, (*History of the United States*, i., 324, 325;) and Hildreth, (*History of the United States*, First Series, iii., 56, 65,) with that fidelity to the truth which distinguished them, as historians, and notwithstanding they were New Englanders, not only recited enough of the facts to enable their respective readers to understand what the General Assembly of New York really did, but they also compared the result of those doings with the doings of the Continental Congress, very much to the credit of the former, without belittling what they regarded as also due to the latter.

[3] *Annual Register for* 1775, "History of Europe," *117.

Except those matters to which we have already referred, nothing which requires a special notice in this narrative, occurred until, in February, 1775, the General Assembly of the Colony rejected the Resolution, submitted by Judge Thomas, of Westchester-county, which provided for the election, by that General Assembly, of Delegates to the proposed Congress of the Continent, to be held at Philadelphia, on the tenth of May ensuing, reference to which has been already made.[1] Four days after that determination, by the General Assembly, to take no official action on the subject referred to, [*February* 27, 1775,] Peter Van Brugh Livingston brought it before the "Committee "of Observation," by which name the Committee of Inspection evidently preferred to be known; and that Committee, notwithstanding its authority was limited to other and entirely different lines of duty, entertained and agreed to a Resolution, offered by that gentleman, "that the Committee take into Consider-"ation, the Ways and Means of causing Delegates to "be elected, to meet the Delegates of the other Col-"onies on this Continent in General Congress, to be "held at Philadelphia, on the 10th Day of May "next."[2] If any other action on the subject of that Resolution was taken at that time, it was not completed when the Committee adjourned; and not until the following Wednesday, [*March* 1, 1775,] at an Adjourned Meeting of the Committee, was the subject disposed of, by ordering the publication of an *Advertisement*, addressed "to the Freeholders and Freemen "of the City and County of New York," in which were made a recital of the recommendation that another Congress should be convened at Philadelphia, on the tenth of May ensuing; a suggestion that an Election of Delegates "ought not longer to be de-"layed;" an acknowledgment that that Committee possessed "no Power without the Approbation of "their Constituents, to take any Measures for the "Purpose;" and a "request" "that the Freeholders "and Freemen of the City and County of New York, "will be pleased to assemble at the Exchange, on "Monday the 6th Instant, at 12 o'clock, to signify "their Sense of the best Method of choosing such "Delegates; and whether they will appoint a cer-"tain Number of Persons to meet such Deputies as "the Counties may elect for that Purpose, and join "with them in appointing out of their Body Dele-"gates for the next Congress."[3] That *Advertisement* was published on the following day, [*March* 2, 1775;][4] and, what was very unusual, those who were opposed to the revolutionary faction of the confederated party of the Opposition appear to have organized, for the purpose of joining issue with the latter, at the proposed Meeting, on the questions which had thus been referred only to those who were either Freeholders or Freemen of the City, in whom, alone, the right of the elective franchise was, then, legally vested.[5]

An unusual excitement appears to have been aroused by the placards with which the walls and the fences throughout the City were covered,[6] and by the impassioned appeals with which the newspapers were filled; and the morning of the sixth of March opened with many appearances which betokened the approach of a serious conflict between the rival factions. As early as nine o'clock, the revolutionary faction, strengthened by many who were neither Freeholders nor Freemen, began to assemble around the Liberty-pole,[7] on which a large Union Flag had been raised, at an early hour; and, at eleven o'clock, preceded by a Band of Music and a large Union Flag, it moved, by a circuitous route, toward the appointed place of meeting, picking up, as it went, such a motley crowd of "boys, sailors, negroes, and New England and "New-Jersey boatmen" as a noisy Band and continuous invitations to "fall in," which have always been incidental to partisan political processions, could not have failed to secure. The conservative faction, strengthened by "some Officers of the Army "and Navy, several of His Majesty's Council, and "those Members of the House of Representatives "who had refused taking into consideration the Pro-"ceedings of the Congress, together with the Officers "of the Customs and other Dependents of the Court, "&c."—the Governmental Party, as far as there was one, having evidently united with the conservative faction of the party of the Opposition, on that occasion—assembled at the Widow De La Montagnie's, at ten o'clock; and that, also, moved, quietly, in a procession, to the Exchange, in season to take part in the proceedings of the proposed Meeting. It is said that "soon after the parties met some confusion "arose, but subsided without any bad consequences" —in other words, blows were exchanged, which, at one time, threatened to become a serious riot.

Isaac Low presided, as Chairman of the Committee who had requested the Meeting and proceeded to explain the purposes of that request, after which he pro-

[1] See page 52, ante.

[2] *Proceedings of the Committee of Observation for the City and County of New York*, at its Adjourned Meeting, February 27, 1775.

[3] *Proceedings of the Committee of Observation for the City and County of New York*, at its Adjourned Meeting, 1st March, 1775.

[4] Holt's *New-York Journal*, No. 1678, NEW-YORK, Thursday, March 2, 1775.

[5] That organization was effected at a public Meeting of the Inhabitants who disapproved the "request" of the Committee, which was held at the Widow De La Montagnie's, in Broadway, opposite the Fields, on Friday evening, March 3, John Thurber presiding.—(A *Broadside, signed by John Thurber*, in the Library of the New York Historical Society.)

[6] The Committee of Observation called its Meetings by means of handbills posted throughout the City; and the Meeting at the Widow De La Montagnie's was called in the same manner.

[7] As nearly as can be ascertained, the Liberty-pole stood in the Fields, now the Park, near the present line of Broadway, opposite the block which is bounded by Murray and Warren-streets.

It occupied a small lot of ground which had been bought for that purpose, by those who styled themselves "Sons of Liberty;" and, as lately as 1785, Isaac Sears, the assign of one of those who had bought it, many years previously, made a claim on the City, and was paid for his interest therein.—(*Manual of the Corporation of the City of New York for* 1856, 433.)

posed the following question: "Whether a certain "Number of persons shall be appointed and author-"ized to meet such Deputies as the Counties may "elect, and join with them for the *sole* object of ap-"pointing out of their body on the 20th of April next, "Delegates to the next Congress?" Those who were opposed to the question, the conservative faction and its governmental allies, promptly demanded a Poll of the Voters, giving as reasons for their demand, that the business of the day was to take only the sense of the Freeholders and Freemen; that none but those of these two classes of persons had a right to vote on the question; and that it was impossible to discriminate them from those who had not such a right. The large body of the members of the Committee who was present, "who had taken upon themselves the part of "Returning-officers," of course, refused the demand—as the number of qualified voters, then present, who were known to have been opposed to the question, was evidently so very largely in the majority, a Poll of the Voters, had one been permitted, would have determined the question in the negative, and have defeated the purpose of those who were seeking another advancement to place and authority, in the proposed Congress of the Colonies—and the question was, of course, declared to have been carried, in favor of the proposition. The second question which was proposed: "Whether "this Meeting will authorize the Committee to nomi-"nate Eleven Deputies for their Approbation?" being of secondary importance to those who had opposed the first, a Poll of the Voters was not demanded thereon; and, of course, like the preceding question, it was adopted "by a very great Majority of the Peo-"ple," promiscuous in its qualifications for such an action, voting *viva voce*. "The Business of the day "being finished," as the record stated, the assemblage dispersed; and, as far as that notable Meeting was concerned, the purposes of those who had evidently obtained the control of the Committee of Inspection, had been fully secured.[1]

There appears to have been thirty-eight of the Members of the Committee of Inspection present at the noon-day Meeting, on the Exchange, which has been described; and, on the evening of the same day, [*March* 6, 1775,] in their capacity as Returning-officers, they reported to the Committee itself, which had assembled in due form, the proceedings of that popular assemblage, including the affirmative answers to the two questions which had been presented to it; and so entirely satisfactory to the Committee was the result of the day's labor, that it directed the detailed statement of those transactions, thus reported to it, to be entered, in full, in the Minutes of its own proceedings. Having thus disposed of the main question, apparently to its entire satisfaction, the Committee then proceeded to nominate, by ballot, eleven persons, "for the Approbation of the Freemen "and Freeholders, for the City and County of New "York, to serve as Deputies to meet such other Dep-"uties as may be appointed by the remaining "Counties in this Province, for the sole Purpose of "electing out of their Body, Delegates for the next "Congress;" and the choice of the Committee fell on Isaac Low, Philip Livingston, James Duane, John Alsop, John Jay, Leonard Lispenard, Abraham Walton, Francis Lewis, Isaac Roosevelt, Alexander McDougal, and Abraham Brasher,[2] notwithstanding Isaac Low had previously "desired a Friend that in "Case he should be put on the Nomination, to de-"clare, in his Behalf, that he should be under the dis-"agreeable Necessity of Dissenting."[3]

It will be seen that, in this last performance, the Committee of Inspection, (or of Observation, as it was pleased to call itself,) notwithstanding the peculiarly aristocratic elements which entered into its composition, had accepted, if it had not resorted to, that questionable element which had been so frequently employed, on former occasions, for the performance of acts, which neither the Law of the Land nor their own self-respect would have permitted its high-toned employers to do, directly, with their own hands—that it had resorted, indeed, to that peculiarly questionable element, outside the limits of plebeian respectability, which Gouverneur Morris had so graphically described, in his letter to Governor Penn, which has been already laid before the reader.[4] It will be seen also, that in exact conformity with such questionable practises, already very well known to every member of the Committee noise and lawless acts of violence, in that last instance, had accomplished, at the Meeting at the Exchange, what an evidently insufficient supply of Freeholders and Freemen, unassisted by those who were not thus qualified to vote, could not have possibly secured to the Committee, on that occasion; and that, among those political tricksters among whom the end justified the means—a class which was evidently well represented in the Committee, at its Meeting on the evening of the sixth of March—the introduction of that very questionable mode of determining grave questions, involving the weal and the woe of the Colony, affirmatively, where, otherwise, the majority of competent voters would, unquestionably, have negatived those questions, was

[1] Holt's *New-York Journal*, No. 1679, NEW-YORK, Thursday, March 9, 1775; *Rivington's New-York Gazetteer*, No. 99, NEW-YORK, Thursday, March 9, 1775; *Proceedings of the Committee of Observation for the City and County of New York*, 6th March, 1775, into which the record of the proceedings of the Meeting at the Exchange, in the Morning, was officially copied; Jones's *History of New York during the Revolutionary War*, i., 37, 38, and de Lancey's *Notes on that History*, i., 180-184; Leake's *Memoir of General John Lamb*, 190; Dawson's *Park and its Vicinity*, 38, 39; Gordon's *History of the American Revolution*, i., 472; Hildreth's *History of the United States*, First Series, iii., 71, 72; etc.

[2] *Proceedings of the Committee of Observation for the City and County of New York*, at its Meeting, "Monday Evening, 6th March, 1775."

[3] Card, signed by Mr. Low and addressed to "THE RESPECTABLE PUB-"LIC" dated "NEW YORK, March 9, 1775."

[4] *Gouverneur Morris to Mr. Penn*, "NEW-YORK, May 20, 1774," pages 11, 12, *ante*.

evidently regarded as an unmoubted success. It seems, however, that, notwithstanding all that apparent success, at the Exchange, the machinery of selfishness did not move without a jar, within itself, as the very decided testimony and dissent of Isaac Low, the Chairman of the Committee as well as that of the Meeting, against whom some underhanded antagonism had been detected, have clearly shown;[1] and it is equally susceptible of proof that a very healthy feeling of disapproval of the dishonorable and unwarrantable proceedings, at that Meeting, which had been held under the auspices of the Committee of Inspection and had been controlled by a majority of the members of that body, was entertained "by a very "great Majority of our Fellow Citizens," throughout the City.[2] Under these circumstances, and with these warnings, it need not be matter of surprise that the Committee which had hastened to award unusual honors to that riotous assemblage, by incorporating what was said to have been a record of its tumultuous doings in the *Minutes* of its own proceedings, with almost as much haste, although with very much less of ostentatious and noisy display than had been previously exhibited in the unseemly approval of it, at an Adjourned Meeting, held within forty-eight hours after its hasty recognition of the doings of that assembled multitude, and prompted by John Jay who, only a few hours before, had been decidedly differently-minded—that Committee, thus predisposed, thus bashfully, thus hastily, and thus prompted, gravely repudiated the questionable vote which "a very great Majority of the People" was said to have given in approval of the fundamental question, concerning the appointment and authorization of Deputies to a proposed Provincial Convention, which, a few hours ago, it had declared to have been adopted "by a very great Majority of the People," at the Exchange; and, quite as gravely and with even greater inconsistency, it also yielded to those whom it had scornfully disregarded, at the Exchange as well as in its own Meeting, the right and the propriety of a Poll of the Voters, by which means the miscellaneous, unfranchised crowd would be silenced and the suffrage and the determination of the question, concerning the election of Delegates to the proposed Continental Congress, be confined to the Freeholders and Freemen of the City and County, to whom, alone, the Committee had originally referred it. It is a notable fact, however, that, notwithstanding the Committee repudiated the first Resolution which the miscellaneous crowd, at the Exchange, was said to have adopted, it rigidly maintained the equally questionable validity of the second Resolution, nominally authorizing the Committee to nominate eleven persons as candidates for the places of Delegates to the proposed Provincial Convention—the opportunity to obtain place and authority, no matter how ill-founded that opportunity might be, was an object so vastly more important to those aristocratic place-seekers, than all others, that, whether promising or unpromising of success, those who controlled that Committee could not possibly abandon it[3]—and, consequently, on the fifteenth of March, a Poll was opened in each Ward, at the usual places of Election, under the inspection, in each instance, of the two Vestrymen of the Ward and two Members of the Committee, who had been appointed for that duty; and the Freeholders and Freemen of the City then formally determined that Deputies should be appointed for the purpose named, and that the eleven nominees of the Committee should be such Deputies, to represent the City and County in the proposed Provincial Congress.[4] The result of the Poll was reported to the Committee on the evening of the same day, [*March* 15, 1775] when that body ordered "that Circular Letters be "written to all the Counties in the Colony, informing "them of the appointment of Deputies for this City "and County, and requesting them, with all con-"venient speed, to elect Deputies to meet in Pro-"vincial Convention, at the City of New York, on "the 20th of next April, for the *sole* purpose of "appointing Delegates to represent this Colony at the "next Congress to be held at Philadelphia the 10th "day of May next."[5]

[1] Card, signed by Mr. Low and addressed to "THE RESPECTABLE PUB-"LIC," dated "NEW YORK, March 9, 1775."

[2] The Communication, signed "IMPARTIAL," dated "NEW YORK, "March 8, 1775," which was printed in *Rivington's New-York Gazetteer*, No. 99, NEW-YORK, Thursday, March 9, 1775.

[3] *Proceedings of the Committee of Observation for the City and County of New-York*, at an Adjourned Meeting, 8th March, 1775.

[4] Holt's *New-York Journal*, No. 1680, NEW-YORK, Thursday, March 16, 1775; *Rivington's New-York Gazetteer*, No. 100, NEW-YORK, Thursday, March 16, 1775;* Gaine's *New-York Gazette: and the Weekly Mercury*, No. 1223, NEW-YORK, Monday, March 20, 1775.

[5] *Proceedings of the Committee of Observation for the City and County of New-York*, "COMMITTEE-CHAMBER, 15th March, 1775."

With the single exception of de Lancey, in his *Notes to Judge Jones's History of New York during the American Revolution*, as far as our acquaintance with them extends, every writer on that subject, ourself included, has supposed and stated that the question of sending Delegates to a proposed Provincial Convention was unquestionably determined by the promiscuous Meeting, at the Exchange, without having seen that that vote had been subsequently repudiated by the Committee, for cause, and that it had been submitted to the Freeholders and Freemen, at the Polls, and definitely determined by them, and only by them, at the same time that Delegates were elected to represent the City and County, in that Convention.

* Holt and Gaine stated the vote to have been eight hundred and twenty-five in favor of the appointment of Deputies, and one hundred and sixty-three in opposition: Rivington stated the vote was nine hundred and twenty-nine, in favor, and one hundred and forty-three in opposition.

They all agree that many voters declined to vote—Holt and Gaine said, because their votes were seen to have been unnecessary: Rivington said "the friends of the *old five Delegates*, (finding that they were not "permitted to vote for them *as Delegates*) almost all declined giving "their voices at all."

They evidently suspected the managers of the movement were seeking to accomplish some mischief against those "*old five Delegates*;" and it may be that Isaac Low, in his declination to appear as a candidate, before the proposed Convention, was influenced by that evidently "crooked" movement. They preferred to vote directly for Delegates, instead of leaving the choice to an irresponsible Convention of politicians, who were evidently in the interest of other aspirants to Congressional honors and emoluments.

There is an abundance of evidence, of unquestionable truthfulness, showing that what has been represented to have been a conflict of rival parties, patriotically representing antagonistic political principles, on the occasion referred to, was, in fact, like all the political contests which had preceded it, during the preceding twelvemonth, only personal, factional, and local, in its origin and character; that it was not, really, concerning the great questions arising from the Colonial policy of the Home Government and the Grievances of the Colonies, relative to which there was very little diversity of sentiment throughout the City; and that, in fact, nothing else were involved in the questions which were submitted to the Meeting, than the local and minor questions concerning the control of the political affairs of the Colony itself and, especially, concerning those who should occupy the places of authority, and influence, and emoluments, therein.

It was conceded, by contemporaneous writers of both factions, that there was, really, no difference of opinion, among the various classes and sects and factions of which the City was composed, concerning the existing necessity for the redress of what were said to have been the Colonial Grievances, and that, if the Parliament should not interpose and indicate a willingness to afford the relief which was required, the proposed Congress ought to be convened, for a further consideration of the subject and for such further action relative thereto as should, then, be considered necessary; and no one, of either faction, pretended to be less loyal to the Sovereign nor less mindful of what were generally regarded as his prerogatives, than his most loyal supporters could have been—indeed, it was a notable fact, that, on the occasion of the Meeting now under consideration, even the revolutionary and miscellaneous crowd who assembled under the Liberty-pole was sheltered by a large Union Flag; and that when it moved from the Fields to the Exchange, with its noisy drum and fife and its yet more noisy attendants, it was preceded by another Union Jack, inscribed with the name and the title of the King.

That it might become expedient and proper to assemble the proposed Congress, if the Parliament should not, meanwhile, have indicated an inclination to redress the alleged Grievances of the Colonies, was not only conceded but freely acknowledged, even by those more earnest conservatives who had assembled at the Widow De La Montagnie's, on the preceding Friday evening; but they, in common with many others, hoped and believed that the Parliament would promptly indicate a willingness to afford the relief which was desired; and, in harmony with that hope and that belief, with a laudable desire to restore the harmony which had formerly prevailed between the Mother Country and the Colonies, and not with any intention to oppose the convention of the Congress, *per se*, they desired only a postponement of the action, in the proposed Meeting, which was designed for the inauguration of a movement for the election of Delegates to that proposed Congress, until the twentieth of April, which would have afforded time for the receipt from London of intelligence concerning the inclination and action of the Parliament, without depriving the Colony of the opportunity to elect its Delegation to the Congress, in due form, if it should become necessary to convene the Congress. But those who were anxiously seeking places and influence were not ignorant of the well-known fact that a sparrow in the hand is worth more than a dove on the roof; and, consequently, they were not willing to postpone the immediate action which would surely secure those desirable advantages to themselves; and they acted accordingly, marshaling their irregular allies, posting their handbills bearing unfounded accusations against their adversaries (accusations which were promptly contradicted in other handbills) accomplishing, or seeming to accomplish, by noise, what, at that time, they could not have accomplished, and did not accomplish, regularly, by the votes of those Freeholders and Freemen who were, then, present.[1] The result of that hasty and violent action has been noticed, and need not be repeated; but, notwithstanding it was subsequently disregarded by the Committee which had previously hastened to receive and accept it, it served to draw the lines of faction with more distinctness and to array neighbor against neighbor, in greater animosity and bitterness than had previously been witnessed.

On the sixteenth of March, 1775, in conformity with the Resolution adopted by the Committee, and under its authority, Isaac Low, the permanent Chairman of the Committee of Inspection, prepared the following Circular Letter; and, very soon afterwards, copies of it were sent to the several County Committees, where such Committees could be found, throughout the Colony:

"NEW-YORK, 16th March, 1775.

"GENTLEMEN:

"The late Congress having deemed it expedient, "that, in the present critical State of American "Affairs, another should be held at Philadelphia, the

[1] The motives of those who, respectively, originated and opposed the call for that Meeting may be best seen and understood in the placard and newspaper literature of that notable event; and in that connection, the original Advertisement, requesting the Meeting, which was published in Holt's *New-York Journal*, No. 1678, NEW-YORK, Thursday, March 2, 1775, was the first of the series. The opponents of the Meeting, who assembled at the Widow De La Montagnie's, on the third of March, issued a handbill, in which reasons for a postponement of the question were stated; on the morning of the day on which the Meeting was held, [*March* 6] a calm appeal, signed "A FREEMAN," and addressed "TO THE INHABITANTS OF NEW YORK," very forcibly urging a postponement of the questions, was published in Gaine's *New-York Gazette and Weekly Mercury*, No. 1221, Monday, March 6, 1775; a more elaborate appeal and argument, to the same effect, addressed "TO THE RESPECTABLE "INHABITANTS OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK," signed "A CITIZEN OF NEW "YORK," and published in the same issue of that newspaper; an elaborate reply to the last, signed "ANOTHER CITIZEN," and published in Holt's *New-York Journal*, No. 1679, NEW-YORK, Thursday, March 9, 1775; etc.

"pth Day of May next; and the neighbouring Colonies having already appointed Delegates for that "Purpose, we beg Leave to call your Attention to "that Subject, and to remark, that the Honour as "well as the Interest of the Province requires that "we also should be fully and properly represented.

"Influenced by these Considerations, this City "and County conceive it highly necessary that a "Provincial Convention should, without Delay, be "formed of Deputies from all the Counties, for the "*sole* Purpose of appointing, out of their Body, Dele-"gates for the next Congress, and therefore have "already chosen their Deputies: They prefer this "Mode to any other, as it tends to unite the Counties, "and to preserve that Harmony between them so "essential to the Interest of our common Cause.

"Be pleased to communicate this Letter to the "Inhabitants of your County; and should they con-"cur with us in Sentiment, we beg they will consider, "whether it would not be best to choose their Depu-"ties so soon as that they may be down here by the "20th of April next; which Day we take the Liberty "of proposing to you as proper for the Meeting of "the Convention.

"We forbear urging any Arguments to induce "your Concurrence, being well persuaded you are "fully sensible that the Happiness of this Colony "and the Preservation of our Rights and Liberties, "depend on our acceding to the General Union and "observing such a Line of Conduct as may be *firm*, "as well as *Temperate*.

"By Order of the Committee:
"ISAAC LOW, Chairman."[1]

It is a very significant fact that, when the Committee's Circular Letter was written and made ready for transmission to Westchester-county, there was no appearance whatever, within that County, of the slightest organized opposition to either the Home or the Colonial Government; and that, among the *débris* of what had been conveniently regarded as a Convention of the County, assembled, in the preceding August, for the election of Deputies to represent the County in the late Congress, at Philadelphia, neither a County nor a Town Committee, actual or imaginary, remained, to bear testimony to the fact that such a Convention had ever existed, or to receive the Committee's Circular Letter and to take action on its recommendation. Indeed, there can be very little doubt that the well-to-do and generally contented farmers, throughout that County, those who were Freeholders quite as much as those who were only Leaseholders of properties on the various Manors, with here and there a rare exception, had continued to gather their crops and to send them to market, during the preceding Autumn; to enjoy their usual indoor and outdoor recreations, during the preceding Winter; and to return to the labors of the season, on their farms or elsewhere, during the earlier weeks of the Spring, as they had done, before, year after year and generation after generation, knowing little and caring less concerning that bitter struggle for commercial gain, no matter how lawlessly conducted, or concerning that equally bitter struggle for the honors and emoluments of political place, no matter with what auxiliaries nor with what disregard of individual and social proprieties and of public morals that struggle should be conducted, which had kept the neighboring City and the entire seaboard in an unceasing and disgraceful turmoil, during that entire period.

It is not now evident, if it ever was, that these honest, hard-working, contented men, in any portion of that unceasing and undisguised indifference to the clamor and the unblushing immorality and the audacious lawlessness of politicians, of high or of low degree, beyond the borders of the County, which they had steadily and consistently presented, were really offenders against any law, human or divine; and it will require more evidence than has yet been presented by those who have spoken or written adversely concerning those quiet Westchester-county farmers and their unostentatious conservatism, to establish the fact, if it be a fact, that, regardless of that peculiar standing which was awarded to Westchester-county, during the period now under consideration, and regardless of the recognized manhood of those who then lived there, the "consent" of those farmers, previously given, was not quite as necessary to have warranted the invasion of their rural quiet and contentment, by those, not of themselves, who were eager to thrust upon them, uninvited, new political methods, new political principles, and a new form of political government, none of which had yet secured their favor and approval, as it was, then, and as it has ever since been, assumed to have been necessary, everywhere, before a political right could be disturbed or a new form of political government be established.

The farmers in Westchester-county, in 1774 and 1775, were quiet men, quietly pursuing their peaceful vocations, interfering with no one, and avoiding the interference of others. They were not political in their aims or inclinations; they had very clearly manifested, over and over again, their disinclination to be associated, in any degree, with those who were inclined to become, if they had not already become, politicians; and, as will be seen, in their action, during the Winter, and in their subsequent actions, under similar circumstances, they were not inclined to be crowded into any political associations, without their consent, without presenting, at least, an open, a manly, and a vigorous opposition. The reader will determine for himself, therefore, how much, if any, there was of individual and social propriety, and how much, if any, there was of consideration for the wel-

[1] This is a copy of the original publication, as it appeared in Gaine's *New-York Gazette and Weekly Mercury*, No. 1223, NEW-YORK, Monday, March 20, 1775.

fare of those farmers or for that of the Colony, dissevered from all other considerations, in the Committee of Inspection, alias the Committee of Observation, for the City and County of New York—a merely local organization, vested with no more than the barest local authority, and that confined, exclusively, to an entirely different service—when it thrust itself, unasked and undesired, into the midst of that peaceful and peacefully inclined community, only in order to disturb that prevailing peace by marshalling those who composed that rural community into rival parties, embittered against each other, without any aim or purpose in which they were, or in which they were likely to become, in the slightest degree interested, and for nothing else than for the promotion of individual aims and for the advancement to political place and authority, of aspiring politicians who were not always entitled, by their individual integrity, to any such advancement, anywhere.

As we have said, there was no Town or County Committee, within Westchester-county, unto whom the Chairman of New York's Committee of Inspection could send the Committee's Circular Letter, to which reference has been made; and other than usual means, therefore, were necessarily resorted to, to secure for it even a nominal circulation, within that County. It is not, now, known, beyond a peradventure, just what means were thus employed; but the copies of that insidious Circular Letter which were intended for residents of Westchester-county were evidently sent to a leading Westchester-county politician; and, by him, whomsoever he may have been, they were so manipulated that they reached only those residents of the County who would most surely promote the political purposes of that particular Westchesterian who had been thus entrusted with the delivery of them.[1]

On the twenty-eighth of March, Theodosius Bartow, Esq., James Willis, and Abraham Guion, Esq., all of New Rochelle; William Sutton, Esq., of Mamaroneck[2]; Colonel Lewis Morris, Thomas Hunt, and Abraham Leggett, of Westchester; Captain Joseph Drake, Benjamin Drake, Moses Drake, and Stephen Ward, of East Chester; and James Horton, Junior, Esq., of Rye,[2] all of them, it said, "having received "letters from the Chairman of the City and County "of New York, relative to the appointment of Deputies for this County," to a proposed Provincial Convention, "met at the White-Plains, for the purpose of "devising means for taking the Sense of the County "upon the Subject."

At best, that meeting of local politicians, or of those who were not indisposed to become politicians, from the south-eastern Towns of the County, no matter by what means they had been induced to go to the White Plains, on that particular March morning, on such an unusual errand, was nothing more nor less than a Caucus of those who were known or supposed to have been in the interest of the Morris family and to have favored the aspirations of those members of that family who hankered after official place and authority. Neither Yonkers, nor Greenburgh, nor any of the Towns to the northward of them and of the White Plains, were in the slightest degree represented in that important assemblage; and every one who had previously appeared as a leader of the farmers of the County, in their very unfrequent political doings, regardless of party associations, appears to have been, also, very carefully excluded, not improbably for the purpose of securing that harmonious action, in a preordained direction, which the presence of older and more experienced rivals might have turned toward some other part of the County than toward the Manor of Morrisania.

The Caucus undoubtedly discharged all the duties which its controlling spirit assigned to it—it took into consideration, after a fashion of its own creation, the subject of the proposed election of Delegates to represent the County, or to assume to do so; and it "agreed to send the following Notification to the "principal Freeholders in the different Towns and "Districts in the County," the designation of whom,

[1] We have preferred to consider that there was an intermediate agency, between the Chairman of the New York Committee and the several Westchester county gentlemen into whose hands his Circular Letters eventually fell, because those gentlemen were mainly residents of the town of Westchester and of the neighboring village of New Rochelle; because there was nothing, in that Circular Letter, which designated any time or place of meeting, for any Caucus or other Assemblage which might be considered necessary, for the particular purposes mentioned in that Circular Letter; because, only on the warrant of that particular Circular Letter, explicitly stated by them, a dozen men, from at least four different Towns, spontaneously came together, at the same time, in a distant Town in which none of them lived, and on the same errand. Not one of the number was from Towns lying northward from the White Plains; not one had come from all the country lying westward from the Bronx-river; there was not present either a Van Cortlandt or a Thomas, already well-known popular leaders, either of whom would have been formidable, as a rival, against any new aspirant for the leadership of the movement and the spoils of office to which that movement tended. There was present, however, one who had, previously, been politically dormant; by whom the machinery of the movement was evidently run; and by whom, subsequently, as will be hereafter seen, entirely through its instrumentality, a place was secured for himself, in the Congress of the Continent, and an opening made for the accession to office and aristocratic consequence and influence, of others of his wide-spread family.

It will have been seen, by every attentive reader, that, very evidently, Isaac Low's package of Circular Letters, intended for circulation in Westchester-county, was entrusted to Lewis Morris, of Morrisania, in the Borough Town of Westchester, a brother-in-law of Isaac Wilkins, of that Town, with the last-named of whom, as the leader of the majority of the General Assembly of the Colony, the reader has been already made acquainted.

In all that had previously been said or done, in behalf of the Colony, in its dispute with the Home Government, not a Morris had been heard, except in that instance when one of them described the unfranchised masses of the Colonists as "poor reptiles" (*vide Page* 12, *ante*); but the fragrance of the distant emoluments and influences of office, more fully developed than ever before, had passed over from the City into Westchester-county; and, reasonably enough to all who knew of the greed for office which every Morris of every period had possessed, both Lewis and Gouverneur, to say nothing of others, were no longer torpid and indifferent.

[2] Subsequently distinguished as Loyalists.

in that selection, having been left to him by whom the Caucus had evidently been controlled—and having, in behalf of somebody else more than in behalf of the body of the County, thus put the political machinery in motion, satisfactorily to themselves and to their chief, the twelve gentleman waded through the Spring-time mud, back, to their respective homes.

The "Notification" to which reference has been made, that which the Caucus authorized to be sent to the elect, among the Freeholders of the County, was in these words:

"March 28th, 1775.

"SIR:

"A number of gentlemen from different districts in "the county of Westchester having this day met at "the White Plains to Consider of the most proper "method of taking the Sense of the *Freeholders*, of "the Said County, upon the Expediency of choosing "Deputies to meet the Deputies of the other Coun-"ties, for the purpose of Electing delegates to repre-"sent this Colony in the General Congress to be held "at Philadelphia on the 10th of May next, are of "opinion that the best way of proceeding for that "purpose, will be to have a general Meeting of the "Freeholders of the Said County.

"As this County is very Extensive we take the "liberty of recommending the meeting to be held at "the White Plains on Tuesday the 11th day of April "next at ten o'clock in the forenoon at the Court "House, and therefore do desire you, to give notice "of the Same to all the freeholders in your district, "without exception, as those who do not appear and "vote on that day, will be presumed to acquiesce in "the Sentiment of the majority of those who vote.

"We are &c."[1]

There can be no good reason for supposing that that Caucus failed to employ the best means which it could control, to secure the attendance, at the appointed place, on the appointed day, and at the designated hour, of all those of the farmers of the County of Westchester, whom it supposed to have been friendly to the Morris family, and who were willing or who could be induced to accept the head of that wealthy and aristocratic, but really unpopular, family, as their political leader—to that family, the stake was a very important one; and, to secure that stake, it played desperately. On the other hand, those of the inhabitants of the County who were conservative in their political opinions, and those who were not favorers of the new-born, but selfish, zeal of the Lord of the Manor of Morrisania, were aroused; and, especially in the Borough Town of Westchester, within which the ancestral home of the Morrises was situated, the ambitious purposes of that gentleman and of his family were empathically snubbed, by a Meeting of his townsmen, duly summoned to take into consideration "whether or not they should choose Deputies "to represent them at a Provincial Convention."[2] Besides that local and evidently personal rebuke, by the townsmen of the Morrises, the great body of "the "Freeholders and Inhabitants of the County of West-"chester," or such of them as were "friends of Gov-"ernment and our happy Constitution," was earnestly appealed to, in the circulation of the following stirring Address:

"*To the Freeholders and Inhabitants of the County of Westchester.*

"NEW-YORK, April 6, 1775.

"You are earnestly desired to attend a general "meeting of the county, to be held at the White "Plains, on Tuesday next, the 11th inst. to give your "votes upon the questions:—

"Whether you are inclined to choose deputies to "meet at the city of New-York, in a Provincial Con-"vention? Or,

"Whether you are determined to abide by the "loyal and judicious measures already taken by your "own worthy representatives in the general assembly "of this province, for a redress of American grievances?

"The consequences that may arise from your ne-"glecting to attend at the White Plains, on Tuesday "next, to declare your sentiments relative to the ap-"pointment of deputies to meet in Provincial Con-"gress, may be very fatal to this county; the friends "of goverment, and our happy constitution, are there-"fore earnestly invited in person, to oppose a measure "so replete with ruin and misery. Remember the "extravagant price we are now obliged to pay for "goods purchased of the merchants, in consequence "of the Non-Importation agreement; and when the "NON-EXPORTATION agreement takes place, we "shall be in the situation of those who were obliged "to make bricks without straw.

"A WHITE OAK."[3]

[1] This narrative of the organization and doings of that notable Caucus, including the copy of the "*Notification*" which was issued, by its authority, is based on the elaborate paper, signed by "LEWIS MORRIS, "*Chairman*," which served as the Credentials of those who appeared in the Provincial Convention, as Deputies from Westchester-county, and which is preserved in the *Credentials of Delegates, Historical Manuscripts relating to the War of the Revolution*—Volume xxiv., Page 25—in the Office of the Secretary of State, at Albany.

The "*Notification*," as printed in the text, was copied from the original Manuscript.

[2] "A Correspondent acquaints us, That, on Monday the 3d of March, "the Inhabitants of the Borough of Westchester met, in Consequence of "a Summons, to give their Sentiments upon a Question, whether or not "they would choose Deputies to represent them at a Provincial Conven-"tion in this City; when they declared themselves already very ably "and effectually represented in the General Assembly of this Province, "by Isaac Wilkins, Esquire;* peremptorily disowned all Congressional "Conventions and Committees, most loyally repeating the old Chorus, "God save the King, which was seconded by three hearty Cheers; and "then the jolly Freeholders and Inhabitants spent the Day with great "Hilarity and good Humour over their Tankards and Bowls."—(Gaine's *New-York Gazette, and the Weekly Mercury*, No. 1226, NEW-YORK, Monday, April 10, 1775.)

[3] This appeal, an exact copy of the original, was printed in *Rivington's New-York Gazetteer*, No. 163, NEW-YORK, Thursday, April 6, 1775.

* The wife of Isaac Wilkins was Isabella Morris, sister of Gouverneur and half-sister of Colonel Lewis Morris, the head of that family.

It is reasonable to suppose that many of the farmers of Westchester-county, whatever their political opinions may have been, were more than usually excited by these extraordinary appeals and by others which have not been preserved, addressed to them by those whom they had hitherto regarded as leaders in political affairs; but it is equally clear that not even those extraordinary means, thus employed, were successful in withdrawing even a respectable minority of the Freeholders, to say nothing of those heads of families who were not Freeholders, who, at that time, inhabited that extensive and thickly settled County, from their homesteads and from the urgent duties, at home, which the opening Spring had imposed upon them. Notwithstanding all the reasons which existed for their continued attention to their respective home duties, however, there were some, relatively a small proportion, of either party, those who were opposed to the Morrises and to the proposition to elect Deputies to a proposed Convention of the Colony and those who favored both, who went to the Plains, on that Tuesday morning, the eleventh of April, as, respectively, they had been requested to go. They went, as farmers were wont to go and as they continue to go, on such occasions, on horseback or on foot, over Westchester-county's Spring-time muddy roads or "across lots," as best suited their individual convenience; and the little Village, what there was of it, scattered along the wide spread Post-road, was undoubtedly, the scene of many a discussion, friendly or unfriendly, as friend met friend or neighbor met neighbor in that ancient thoroughfare, each intent, as farmers only can be intent, on the promotion of the particular cause to which each had become especially devoted. Reasonably enough, the two Taverns which were, then, prominent within the limits of the Village, were made the stopping-places of those rural incomers unto whom no Village householder had extended a Village welcome, Captain Hatfield, the landlord of one of those Taverns, entertaining those who were opposed to the Morrises and to the proposed election of Deputies, while those who favored that family and that proposed election, "put up in another "Public House in the Town," probably that which was kept by Isaac Oakley.[1]

It is evident that neither of the two factions was very punctual in its attendance, at the appointed hour—a practice which is continued to this day, in Westchester-county, on similar occasions—and, for a reason which was perfectly obvious, the promoters of the proposed Meeting, very evidently, were not in a hurry to assume the great responsibility of carrying forward the schemes of the revolutionary faction in the City of New York, to which they had been invited, especially in view of the greater number of those who were opposed to those schemes, and who were present and apparently prepared to oppose them; while those who were opposed to the Morrises and to their schemes and to the proposed election, and whose evidently superior numbers had served to dampen the ardor of their opponents, could do nothing else than to wait, and to watch the progress of events. Notwithstanding the hour of ten had been named in the *Notification* through which the assembled farmers had thus met, it was nearly noon before any attempt to organize a Meeting was made—probably, some whose presence was desired and expected, had not arrived; probably, those leaders of the movement who were present were, meanwhile, "comparing notes," and arranging plans of action, and enjoying that social glass, frequently renewed, of which their Chairman subsequently made mention, unwittingly; most probably, the superior numbers of those who were known to be opposed to them, whose strength of numbers was being constantly increased, warned the ambitious Lord of the Manor of Morrisania and his adherents that "the "better part of Valor is—Discretion."

About twelve o'clock, however, those who favored the Morrises and the proposed election of Deputies appear to have quietly and noiselessly left the Tavern, passed over the old post-road, and re assembled in the Courthouse; organized a Meeting; and appointed Colonel Lewis Morris, its Chairman. It was done quietly, if it was not done secretly: it was done quietly, without inviting any others than those of their own faction, to assemble with them: it was done quietly and in a manner which clearly indicated that something else than an untrammeled and unbiased expression of the will of all those who were present—carrying with it, also, the assumed acquiescence of all those who were not present—concerning the Morrises and the questions which were propounded in the *Notification*, was chiefly desired, and must be procured, "by fair means or by foul:" most evidently, it was done, quietly, with an inclination and a hope that it might accomplish all the purposes of

[1] *Protest of the Inhabitants and Freeholders of Westchester-county, New-York*, "COUNTY OF WESTCHESTER, April 13, 1775," published in *Rivington's New-York Gazetteer*, No. 105, NEW YORK, Thursday, April 20, 1775; and in Gaine's *New-York Gazette: and the Weekly Mercury*, No. 1227, NEW YORK, Monday, April 17, 1775.

We have been favored by our unwearied friends, Hon. Lewis C. Platt and Hon. J. O. Dykman with information, concerning these two Taverns, which our readers will find worthy of their remembrance.

Captain Hatfield's Tavern stood almost due South from the old Court-house, and nearly half a mile distant, on the North side of the OLD stage-road to New York,—the line of that road has been changed, since 1775—on property more recently owned by Samuel E. Lyon, Esq., and now by the heirs of the late Alfred Waller, Esq.

The old building has been removed from the place on which it stood, in 1775, to a place, further to the northward, not far from the site of the old Court-house; and is now occupied as a tenement.

Isaac Oakley's Tavern stood on the East side of the old stage-road, directly opposite to the old Court-house. We remember the old house, very distinctly, having often seen it and, more than once, at least forty years ago, having slept under its roof. It is said that it was burned, about 1868; and that the site remains unoccupied.

The old Court-house, the scene of many an adventure during the later Colonial era, occupied the site of the present residence of W. P. Fiero, Esq., on the West side of the stage road to New York.

those who had originated and promoted it, secretly and rapidly, without alarming those who were assembled at Captain Hatfield's, and before they could be brought to the Courthouse, to defeat those purposes and to relegate the Morrises to that political obscurity in which, very ungraciously, they had so long and so ingloriously rested. It was, in short, nothing else than a political *coup-de-main;* but, unfortunately for the honor of those who participated in it, it was not as respectably successful as those who had contrived it, had desired.[1]

Intelligence of the movement of their opponents very soon reached those who were assembled at Captain Hatfield's Tavern; and we are told that, undoubtedly with very little delay, they, also, "walked "down to the Courthouse, although not half of their "friends who were expected had yet appeared." At that time, when the full force of all who thus presumed to act, in so vital a question, in the name of all who were, then, in Westchester-county—and that, too, without any delegation of authority and, certainly, without any expressed "consent"—was undoubtedly present and acting, there was not present more than from a hundred to a hundred and twenty-five, Freeholders and others; and there is evidence that quite as large a number, Freeholders and others, walked down to the Courthouse, from Captain Hatfield's Tavern, and stripped all the novelty and all there was of what was said to have been integrity from the exposed and unsuccessful *coup-de-main.*[2] The individual respectability of none of these, of either faction, appears to have been impeached by any one; but Colonel Morris subsequently attempted to depreciate the political standing of some of those who were not of his supporters, by saying there were among them "many tenants who were not entitled to vote," etc., —they were recognized as respectable farmers, even by that particular Morris who aimed to belittle them; but, in the presence of such as he, with nothing but what he had inherited, to ensure to him even a nominal respectability, they were evidently expected to be no more than dumb dogs, even while their homes and their properties were put in jeopardy and the peace and happiness of their families endangered by the doings of those "better classes," before one of whom they then stood.

It is said that Isaac Wilkins, of the Borough of Westchester, and Colonel Frederic Philipse, of the Manor of Philipsborough, both of them Members of the General Assembly of the Colony, walked at the head of those who moved from the Tavern to the Courthouse, and who interrupted the proceedings of the Meeting; and all agreed that, when the entire number of those new incomers had entered the Courtroom, without indecorously attempting to disturb the Meeting, in the slightest degree, Isaac Wilkins, in behalf of those with whom he had come, "declared that, as they had been unlawfully called "together, and for an unlawful purpose, they did not "intend to contest the matter, by a Poll, which would "be tacitly acknowledging the authority that had "summoned them thither; but that they had come only "with a design to protest against all such disorderly "proceedings, and to shew their detestation of all un-"lawful Committees and Congresses. They then fur-"ther declared their determined resolution to continue "steadfast in their allegiance to their gracious and "merciful Sovereign, King George the Third; to sub-"mit to lawful authority; and to abide by and sup-"port the only true representatives of the People of "this Colony, the General Assembly." They then gave three cheers, and returned to Captain Hatfield's Tavern, "singing, as they went, with a loyal enthusi-"asm, the grand and animating Song of

"'God save great George, our King,
"'Long live our noble King! etc."[3]

After the protestants had thus peacefully left the Courthouse, the Meeting returned to the business for the transaction of which it had been convened and organized; and the question was submitted, by the Chairman, "Whether they would appoint Depu-"ties for this County, to meet the Deputies of the "other Counties, at the City of New York, on the "twentieth of April instant, for the purpose of "electing Delegates to represent this Colony in the "General Congress, to be held at Philadelphia, on

[1] From the fact that the Meeting had been organized and "had already "entered upon the business of the day," before it was known to those who were at Hatfield's Tavern, that any movement toward such an organization had been made—a fact which was openly stated in the *Protest* of the one faction without having been controverted in the elaborate reply of the Chairman of the Meeting—the secrecy of the movement is established, beyond a question. The motives of those who contrived that particular mode of operations, will be manifest to all who are acquainted with the facts and with the practices of unscrupulous politicians, in Westchester-county as often as elsewhere.

[2] In the narrative which the Chairman of the Meeting prepared, immediately after the adjournment of that Meeting, he stated that "a very "numerous body of the Freeholders of the County assembled at the "Court House;" and that "an inconsiderable number of Persons "(among whom were many tenants not entitled to a vote) with Isaac "Wilkins, Esq., and Col. Philipse at their Head, then appeared." In the *Protest of the Inhabitants and Freeholders*, subsequently published, it is stated, specifically, that when those from Captain Hatfield's Tavern entered the Courthouse, "the numbers on each side seemed to be nearly "equal; and both together might amount to two hundred or, at most, "two hundred and fifty." Nearly a month after the publication of that *Protest*, and after he had secured the seat in the Continental Congress for which he had so earnestly hankered—his half-brother, Gouverneur, being then an aspirant to a seat in the proposed Provincial Congress, to which he was elected, on the following day—Lewis Morris published an elaborate and very minute reply to that *Protest*, in which, although nearly every feature of the latter was bitterly controverted, he conveniently said nothing whatever of the number of those, of either faction, who were at the Plains; and, therein, he emphatically acquiesced in what was said, on that subject, with so much precision, in the *Protest*.

[3] There is very little difference, concerning what occurred in the Courtroom, in the narrative drawn up by Lewis Morris and in that portion of the *Protest* which relates to that subject; and both are referred to, as authorities, for what has been said, in the text, relative thereto. Concerning what was done, elsewhere, by the protestants, after they had left the Courthouse, the *Protest* is our sufficient authority.

"the tenth day of May next." By an unanimous vote, it determined to do so; and it then appointed, also without opposition, Colonel Lewis Morris and Doctor Robert Graham—the latter a kinsman of the former—both of Westchester; Stephen Ward, of Eastchester; Colonel James Holmes and Jonathan Platt, of Bedford; John Thomas, Junior, of Rye; and Samuel Drake and Philip Van Cortlandt, both of the Manor of Cortlandt; a majority of whom was authorized to represent the County, and to cast the Vote of the County, in the proposed Convention.[1]

The following Resolutions were, then, submitted to the Meeting; and they were duly adopted, also without a dissenting voice:

"RESOLVED: That the thanks of this body be "given to the virtuous Minority of the General "Assembly of this Province, and particularly to "John Thomas and Pierre Van Cortlandt, Esquires, "two of our Representatives, for their firm attach-"ment to and zeal, on a late occasion for the preser-"vation of the union of the Colonies and the Rights "and Liberties of America; and that this Resolve be "communicated, by the Chairman, to every Gentle-"man of whom that Minority consisted.

"RESOLVED: That the thanks of this country is "due to the Delegates who composed the late Con-"gress, for the essential services they have rendered "to America, in general; and that this Resolve be "forthwith published."

We are told, also, by the Chairman of the Meeting, that, "after the business of the day was thus con-"cluded, the people gave three huzzas for our gra-"cious Sovereign,[2] and dispersed, quickly, without the "least disorder."[3]

Although no action, on that subject, appears to have been taken by the Meeting, its master-spirit and Chairman, in his official capacity, appears to have continued the work for which the Meeting had been convened, completing it before he left the White Plains, by preparing an official narrative of the origin of the Meeting; of the Caucus which had "recom-"mended" it; of its Proceedings, when convened; and of its noisy loyalty to that "gracious Sove-"reign" whose recognized authority it had so boldly assailed. That narrative was duly published; and, at the expense of repeating some matters of which mention has been already made, as an important portion of the historical literature of Westchester-county, a place is made for it, in this work. It was in the following words:

"WHITE PLAINS, IN THE COUNTY OF WESTCHESTER "the 11th day of April 1775.

"On the 28th day of March last, the following "Gentlemen having received letters from the Chair-"man of the Committee of the City and County of "New-York relative to the appointment of Deputies "for this County, met at this place for the purpose of "devising means for taking the Sense of this County "upon the Subject, viz:

"Col. Lewis Morris,	Theodosius Barlow, Esq.,[4]
"Thomas Hunt,	William Sutton, Esq.,
"Abraham Leggot,	Capt. Joseph Drake,
"James Horton, Jr., Esq.,	James Willis,
"Stephen Ward,	Benjamin Drake,
"Abraham Guion, Esq.,	Moses Drake,

"who having taken the Same into consideration, "agreed to send the following notification to the "principal freeholders in the different Towns and "districts in the County, viz—

"'March 28th, 1775.

"'SIR. A number of gentlemen from different dis-"'tricts in the county of Westchester having this "'day met at the White Plains to Consider of the "'most proper method of taking the Sense of the "'*Freeholders*, of the said County, upon the Expedi-"'ency of choosing Deputies to meet the Deputies of "'the other Counties, for the purpose of Electing

[1] As Jonathan Platt and Colonel Holmes did not accept the appointment, and as only six took their seats in the Convention, the majority which was necessary to cast the vote of the County was reduced to four; and, thus, the control of the Delegation was retained by those who went from Westchester, Eastchester, and Rye.

[2] The practice of all, at that period and subsequently, on all such occasions as that referred to in the text, will sufficiently indicate to the reader, that the enthusiasm for the King which was displayed, as much by one faction as by the other, at the White Plains, on that eventful April day, was due quite as much to what had been drunk at the two Taverns, before either of those factions had gone to the Courthouse, as to the love for the King which either of them really possessed. But the Chairman of the Meeting kindly furnished conclusive evidence on the subject, when he wrote, "much pains, I confess, were, on that day, "taken, to make temporary enthusiasts, and with other more *exhilara-"ting spirit* than the spirit of loyalty."—(*Lewis Morris to the Publick*, "MORRISANIA, May 7, 1775.")

Only culprits "confess" a wrong-doing; and with this "confession" of one of the principal offenders, on the occasion referred to, the reader will be enabled to understand how small an amount of genuine *patriotism* there was, in such a crowd, no matter for whom it hurrahed; and how small the price was with which that crowd had been purchased, to further the purposes of either "the friends of the Government" or those of the revolutionary faction—may he not be enabled to understand, also, something more of those who originated and fostered the revolutionary spirit, in the Colonies, and something more of the means which they employed, call them what you may, than those, claiming to be "historians," with a very few really honorable exceptions, have hitherto told to him?

One of the most important political movements in which New York has ever been engaged, was carried through Westchester-county in known opposition to the great body of its inhabitants, and in the face of a formal *Protest* of a larger number, by only a factional minority, in the interest of an aspiring politician, and while that minority was staggering under the evil influences of the New England Rum which had been freely dispensed, for that particular purpose.

[3] The narrative, signed by "LEWIS MORRIS, *Chairman*," already referred to, has afforded a sufficient authority, for all that has been said, in the text, concerning the Meeting, after the protestants had left the Courthouse.

[4] Although the name was thus written, in the original manuscript, there can be no doubt that reference was made to Theodosius Bartow, second son of the Rev. John Bartow, the first Rector of the Parish of Westchester. Mr. Bartow subsequently held the comfortable and profitable place of a "Commissary at New Rochelle;" and his son, (subsequently Rector of St. Matthew's Church, at Bedford) held the profitable place of Quarter-master, in the First Westchester-county Regiment.

"'delegates to represent this Colony in the General "'Congress to be held at Philadelphia on the 10th of "'May next, are of opinion that the best way of pro- "'ceeding for that purpose, will be to have a general "'Meeting of the Freeholders of the Said County.

"'As this County is very Extensive we take the lib- "'erty of recommending the meeting to be held at "'the White Plains on Tuesday the 11th day of April "'next at ten o'clock in the forenoon at the Court "'House, and therefore do desire you, to give notice "'of the Same to all the freeholders in your district, "'without exception, as those who do not appear and "'vote on that day, will be presumed to acquiesce "'in the Sentiment of the majority of those who vote.

"'We are, &c.'

"The above notice having been generally given "and distributed, a very numerous body of the Free- "holders of the County assembled at the Court "House at the White Plains, on this day, and chose, "Col. Lewis Morris for their Chairman.

"An inconsiderable number of Persons (among "whom were many tenants not entitled to a vote) with "Isaac Wilkins, Esq., and Col. Philipse at their "head, then appeared, and Mr. Wilkins in their be- "half as he said, declared that they would not join "in the business of the day or have anything to "do with Deputies or congresses, but that they came "there, for the sole purpose of protesting against "such illegal and unconstitutional proceedings, after "which they departed.

"The following Question was then put to the peo- "ple by the chairman, viz:

"'Whether they would appoint Deputies for this "'county, to meet the Deputies of the other counties "'at the city of New York on the 20th of April in- "'stant, for the purpose of electing delegates to re- "'present this colony in the general congress to be "'held at Philadelphia on the 10th day of May "'next.'

"To which Question they unanimously answered that they would.

"They then appointed the following eight persons, "or the majority of them, to be the deputies of this "county, for the purposes aforesaid, viz:

"Col. *Lewis Morris*,	*John Thomas, Jr., Esq.*,
"*Stephen Ward*,	*Jonathan Platt, Esq.*,
"*Samuel Drake, Esq.*,	*Robert Graham, Esq.*,
"Col. *James Holmes*,	Major *Philip Van Courtlandt*.

"The two following Resolves were then unani- "monsly Entered into, viz:

"*Resolved*, that the thanks of this Body be given to "the virtuous minority of the general Assembly of "this Province, and particularly to John Thomas and "Pierre Van Cortlandt, Esqrs., two of our representa- "tives for their firm attachment to and zeal, on a late "occasion for the preservation of the Union of the "Colonies and the rights and liberties of America; "and that this Resolve be communicated by the "chairman, to every gentleman of whom that min- "ority consisted.

"*Resolved*, That the thanks of this country is due "to the delegates who composed the late congress for "the Essential Services they have rendered to Amer- "ica in general, and that this Resolve be forthwith "published.

"After the business of the day was thus concluded, "the people gave three Huzzas for our gracious "Sovereign and dispersed quickly[1] without the least "disorder.

"LEWIS MORRIS, *Chairman*."[2]

In the proceedings of the revolutionary faction, after its Meeting was organized, probably because of a consciousness of its own relative weakness within the County, there was an evident attempt to appear, at least, to be fair and honest in whatever was said or done—no personalities or harsh words, of any kind, appear to have been used against those who entered its Meeting, and respectfully protested against the organization and doings and purposes of that Meeting; the County, as such, was not referred to, in either of the two Resolutions which were adopted, the thanks of nothing else than those who were then present and voting having been voted to the minority of the General Assembly, while an obligation then due to the Continental Congress, which rested on the entire country, if that Meeting was not misinformed, was simply recognized by it, without an attempt being made for the liquidation of even its own portion of the debt—it gave its thanks to the minority of the Colonial Assembly; but it had no thanks to spare for the Continental Congress;—no attempt was made, then or afterwards, to exult over the results of the Meeting; the narrative written by the Chairman of the Meeting continued that commendable courtesy; and, the principal purpose of the Meeting, if not its only purpose, the restoration of the Morris family to the political life from which it had been excluded, having been accomplished, the peace of the County, for the present, was not further disturbed; although it is scarcely possible that every one continued, thenceforth, to regard all his neighbors with the same friendly feelings which had bound them together, during the past.

While the Meeting at the Courthouse was thus quietly engaged in the continued discharge of "the "business of the day," those who had protested, before it, against the call for the Meeting as well as against its proposed proceedings, returned to Captain Hatfield's Tavern, where they were joined, during the afternoon, by "many of their friends;" and "they

[1] In some of the re-prints of this paper, this word is called "quietly:" we have preferred to use the word which was used by the author, in the original manuscript.

[2] This is an exact copy of the original manuscript, which was used as the Credentials of the Deputies and has been preserved in the *Credentials of Delegates*, Volume xxiv., Page 25, *Historical Manuscripts relating to the War of the Revolution*, in the Office of the Secretary of State, at Albany.

"proceeded to draw up and sign a *Declaration*, which "they seemed to do," it is said, "with as much patriotic zeal as ever warmed the hearts of true and "faithful Subjects; and, afterwards, they dispersed to "their different habitations.[1]"

A narrative of the events was subsequently written, probably by Isaac Wilkins, and, with the *Declaration* affixed, it was printed in the newspapers of the day, where, from that day to this, they have remained, serving as authorities in the history of that period. The narrative and the *Declaration* are in these words:

"*County of Westchester, April* 13, 1775.

"MR. RIVINGTON,

"Be pleased to insert the following, and you will "oblige a number of your Friends and Subscribers:

"ON Thursday the 11th inst. a very respectable number of freeholders and inhabitants of the county "of Westchester, assembled at the White Plains, in "the said County, agreeable to notice given, that "their sentiments might be known concerning the "choice of a committee, to meet other committees in "the city of New-York, for the purpose of choosing "delegates to represent this colony in the next Continental Congress.

"The friends to order and government met at the "house of Captain Hatfield. Those who were for "a committee, put up at another public house in "the town. About 12 o'clock word was brought to "the gentlemen at Captain Hatfield's that the opposite party had already entered upon the business of "the day. Upon which they immediately walked "down to the Courthouse, although not half of their "friends who were expected, had yet appeared; where "they found the other company collected in a body. "The numbers on each side seemed to be nearly "equal, and both together might amount to 200, or "at most 250. The friends to government then declared, that as they had been unlawfully called together, and for an unlawful purpose, they did not "intend to contest the matter with them by a poll, "which would be tacitly acknowledging the authority that had summoned them thither; but that they "came only with a design to PROTEST against all "such disorderly proceedings, and to shew their detestation of all unlawful committees and congresses. They then declared their determined "resolution to continue stedfast in their allegiance to "their gracious and merciful sovereign King George "the Third—to submit to lawful authority, and to "abide by and support the only true representatives "of the people of this colony, the General Assembly. "Then giving three huzzas, they returned to Captain "Hatfield's, singing as they went, with loyal enthusiasm, the good and animating song of,

"'God save great George our King,
"'Long live our noble King, &c.'

"At their return, finding that many of their friends "had arrived during their absence, and that many "still kept coming in, they proceeded to draw up, and "sign the following *declaration*, which they seemed to "do with as much patriotic zeal, as ever warmed the "hearts of true and faithful subjects, and afterwards "dispersed to their different habitations.

"'WE the subscribers, freeholders and inhabitants of the county of Westchester, having assem-"'bled at the White Plains, in consequence of certain "'advertisements, do now declare, that we met here to "'express our honest abhorrence of all unlawful con-"'gresses and committees, and that we are determined "'at the hazard of our lives and properties, to sup-"'port the King and Constitution, and that we ac-"'knowledge no representatives but the General "'Assembly, to whose wisdom and integrity we sub-"'mit the guardianship of our rights and privileges.

"'Frederick Philipse,	Jacob Post,
"'Isaac Wilkins,	Joseph Gidney,
"'Samuel Seabury,	James Baxter,
"'Luke Babcock,	John Hart,
"'Jonathan Fowler, Judge,	Cornelius Losee,
"'Caleb Fowler, Judge,	Jesse Park,
"'Jonathan P. Horton, Esq.;	Roger Purdy, jun.
"'William Sutton, Esq.;	Gilbert Pugsley,
"'Daniel Oakly, Esq.;	Abraham Leadeau,
"'Benjamin Fowler, Esq.;	Benjamin Brown,
"'William Davids, Esq.;	Isaac Keed.
"'William Anderson, Esq.;	Aaron Buis,
"'William Barker, Esq.;	Moses Weymen,
"'Capt. Abra. Hatfield, Esq.;	Israel Underhill,
"'Natha Underhill, Mayor,	John Baisley,
"'George Cornwell, Esq.;	David Oakley, jun.
"'Philip Pell, Esq.;	Isaac Smith,
"'Joshua Pell,	John Hyatt.
"'James Pell,	Hezekiah Cudney,
"'Edward Pell,	Abraham Odell,
"'John Hunt,	Thomas Lawrence,
"'Gilbert Horton,	John Seyson,
"'Adrian Leforge,	Jeremiah Travis,
"'Joshua Gidney,	Griffen Corey,
"'Jonathan Gidney,	Isaa Fersheu,
"'Lieut. Jonathan Purdy,	Gabriel Requeaw,
"'Solomon Gidney,	Samuel Webb,
"'Joseph Bude,	Benjamin Downing.
"'James Whetmore,	Gabriel Archer,
"'Moses Williams,	Elias Secord,
"'John Haight,	Thomas Veal,
"'Isaac Brown,	James Pierce,
"'Philip Kelly,	Edward Bugbe,
"'James Hains,	David Haight,
"'Joseph Hains, Jun.	Sylvanus Lyon,
"'James Hains, Jun.	Daniel Haight,
"'Matthew Hains,	John Williams,
"'Bartholomew Hains,	Joseph Purdy,
"'Gilbert Hains,	Ezekiel Halstead,
"'John Hains,	John Hunt, jun.

[1] *The Declaration* here referred to, forms a portion of the *Protest* which is published, in full, on this page, below, and on page 73 post., and the reader is referred to it, in that place.

"'Elijah Hains,	Isaac Purdy,
"'Lieut. Solomon Fowler,	Elijah Purdy,
"'Isaac Williams,	Abraham Losee,
"'John M'Collum,	Isaac Tomkins,
"'Joseph Clark,	William Grey,
"'Joseph Oakly,	Nathaniel Merit,
"'Caleb Ferris,	Joseph Fulling,
"'Capt. Benjamin Griffen,	Hendricus Storm,
"'Capt. Joshua Purdy,	Francis Secord,
"'James Mott,	John Parker,
"'Lieut. William Lacasberry,	Gilbert Harfield,
"'Lieut. Samuel Purdy,	Gabriel Purdy,
"'John Rutlin,	Alexander Haines,
"'Nathan Osborn,	Benjamin Ogden,
"'Philemon Halstead,	Thomas Merritt,
"'Daniel Purdy,	Gilbert Bates,
"'John Crab,	John Gidney,
"'Izariah Whetmore,	Stephen Arnode,
"'Capt. Absolom Gidney,	Israel Secord,
"'David Haight,	John Arnode,
"'John Brown,	David Purdy,
"'Jasper Stivers,	David Belcher,
"'Peter M'Farthing,	Jordan Downing,
"'Joshua Purdy, jun.	Levi Devoe,
"'Haccaliah Purdy, jun.	Abraham Acker,
"'James Tomkins,	Corn. Van Tassell,
"'Michael Chatterton,	Elisha Merit,
"'Elnathan Taylor,	Jacob Schureman,
"'Gilbert Theal,	Joseph Appleby,
"'William Saxen,	John Tomkins, jun.
"'Thomas Champenirs,	Job Hadden, jun.
"'John Champenirs,	Patrick Carey,
"'William Griffin,	James Hart,
"'Isaac Gidney,	Gilbert Ward,
"'John Bates,	Monmouth Hart,
"'Joseph Haviland,	William Dunlap,
"'Eleazer Hart,	Joshua Ferris,
"'Timothy Whetmore,	Timothy Purdy,
"'James Hunt,	James Maguire,
"'Joseph Parker,	James Regnaw,
"'Joshua Barns,	Daniel Shadin,
"'Joseph Purdy,	Samuel Purdy,
"'John Park	Sylvanus Purdy,
"'Samuel Purdy,	William Dalton,
"'Gilbert Purdy,	David Davids,
"'James Chatterton,	Elijah Purdy, jun.
"'John Dusenburgh,	Elijah Tomkins,
"'Thomas Cromwell,	Daniel Jerow,
"'Solomon Horton,	Charles Lawrence,
"'Peter Busing,	Joseph Purdy, jun.
"'Peter Busing, jun.	James Sniffen, jun.
"'James Kniffen,	Thomas Valentine,
"'Nathaniel Underhill, jun.	Gilbert Valentine,
"'Philip Fowler,	Abraham Rich,
"'John M'Farthing,	Andrew Gerow,
"'John Tomkins,	Gilbert Hunter,
"'Joseph Hart,	Lieut. Peter Bonet,
"'Samuel Sneden,	Isaac Merit,
"'Peter Fashee,	Edward Merit,
"'Jesse Lawrence,	John Gale,
"'William Sneden,	John Smith,
"'Lieut. Daniel Knap,	Roger Purdy,
"'Solomon Dean,	James Hart, jun.
"'Charles Vincent, sen.	Jonathan Purdy, jun.
"'Lieut. Thomas Hyat,	Monmouth Hart, jun.
"'James Gidney,	Christopher Purdy,
"'William Woodward,	Gabriel Purdy,
"'Jonathan Budd,	Edward Merit, jun.
"'John Whetmore,	Elijah Miller,
"'William Underhill,	Henry Disborough,
"'Thomas Brown,	Benjamin Hunt,
"'Lieut. Isaac Gidney,	Elnathan Hunt,
"'Nehemiah Tomkins,	William Van Wart,
"'Henry Leforge,	Abraham Storm,
"'Evert Brown,	Thomas Berry,
"'Benjamin Beyea,	Lancaster Underhill,
"'Bartholomew Gidney,	Charles Merit,
"'Josiah Brown,	Benjamin Underhill,
"'Seth Purdy,	Benjamin Griffin, jun.
"'Peter Huggeford,	Jeremiah Coon,
"'Jacob Gidney,	John Hall,
"'John Loce,	James Angevine,
"'Elnathan Appleby,	Jacob Coon,
"'John Baker,	Jeremiah Anderson, jun.
"'Jonathan Underhill,	Gilbert Williams,
"'James M'Chain,	William Barker, jun.
"'Benjamin Seacord,	Gideon Arden,
"'Joshua Hunt,	William Field,
"'Betts Chatterdon,	Joseph Purdy,
"'William Landrine,	George Storm,
"'Enoch Hunt,	Jacob Vermiller,
"'Peter Corne,	Samuel Heasted,
"'Dennis Kennedy,	Bartow Underhill,
"'James Hains,	Lieut. John Warner,
"'Andrew Bainton,	Nathaniel Purdy,
"'Hezekiah Simmons,	Isaac Bennet,
"'Nathaniel Tomkins,	Samuel Baker,
"'Caleb Archer,	John Cornwell,
"'Benjamin Bagbee,	John Storm,
"'Francis Purdy,	Andrew Fowler,
"'William Odell,	Joshua Secord,
"'Israel Hunt,	George French,
"'Thomas Tomkins,	John Underhill,
"'Frederick Underhill,	Caleb Gidney,
"'Peter Post,	William Underhill, jun.
"'Benjamin M'Cord,	James Hill,
"'John Williams,	William Watkins,
"'John Ackerman,	John Rustin,
"'Peter Rusting,	Richard Baker,
"'Thomas Barker,	William Ascough,
"'Jeremiah Hunter	Bishop Heustice,
"'Abraham Storm,	James Miller,
"'Peter Jenning,	Phineas Hunt,'

"The following persons, not being able to attend at "the Plains, requested by their Friends that their "names might be added to the list of protestors, viz.:

"John Hunt, Esq.,	Jeremiah Hitchcock,
"Philip Palmer, Esq.,	William Bond,
"John Hitchcock,	Joseph Bond.

"The foregoing account is strictly true, as can be

"proven by the testimony (or if necessary by the affi-
"davits) of a number of persons, of the most unques-
"tionable character in this county. What then must
"we think of such persons as have propagated a report,
"that the friends of government were upon this occa-
"sion out-numbered 5 to 1, and that many of the
"persons whose names were subscribed to the fore-
"going *Declaration*, were not on that day present at
"the White Plains? They must be conscious to
"themselves, that they have spread abroad a falsehood,
"and they are hereby called upon if they dare to set
"their names to those assertions.

"In what manner those Gentlemen who chose the
"Committee at the Plains proceeded, we cannot posi-
"tively say: But this we can declare with truth, that
"we do not believe they can produce to the public
"the names of an hundred and fifty persons who
"voted for a Committee that day, and we are verily
"persuaded that they did their utmost to make their
"party as numerous as possible. How then can they
"justify their choice of a Committee? Or how can
"they presume to impose upon the world, and to
"insult the loyal county of Westchester, in so bare-
"faced a manner?

"It is well-known here, that two-thirds at least of
"the inhabitants of this county, are friends to order
"and government, and opposed to Committees and all
"unlawful combinations[1]; and it will be made ap-
"parent to the world, that they are so, as soon as
"certain resolves now signing freely by the people,
"shall be ready for publication.—And one principal
"reason why the friends to government did not assem-
"ble in greater numbers than they did on Tuesday
"last, was, that many of them had already, by sign-
"ing those resolves, testified their loyalty to the
"King, their attachment to the constitution, their
"enmity to Committees, and their acquiescence in the
"prudent measures taken by their Assembly in the
"late session, for accommodating the unhappy differ-
"ences between the mother country and the colonies;
"and consequently thought they had already done
"their duty.[2]

"The Committee that was chosen, may, with some
"kind of propriety, be said to represent those partic-
"ular persons who chose them: But how they can
"be denominated the representatives of the County
"of Westchester, who in general abhor Committees
"and Committee-men; and are determined to take
"no steps that may have the least tendency to lead
"them into Rebellion, we cannot conceive. Certainly
"the friends to government who were collected at
"Captain Hatfield's, had a better right, from their
"number, to determine that there should be no Com-
"mittee, than the opposite party had to appoint one.
"and might with much greater propriety be said to
"shew the sense of the county, than the few who
"acted without authority, and in direct opposition to
"government, and to the determinations of our worthy
"Assembly. And we doubt not but the impartial
"public will consider the matter in this light, and
"not esteem the act of a few individuals, unlawfully
"assembled, as the act (which it most assuredly is
"not) of the very *respectable*, *populous* and *loyal* coun-
"ty of WESTCHESTER."[3]

The promoters of the Meeting were evidently only a minority of those present, at the Courthouse, on that memorable eleventh of April: and it is equally evident that if those who were opposed to them had pursued a different line of conduct and had joined issue with them, on the main question, the weight of the County would have been emphatically cast on the side of the conservatives, and in opposition to the election of Delegates to the proposed Convention. But the majority, very correctly, considered that were it to assert its undoubted power, within the Meeting, and to participate in the proceedings of that Meeting, no matter for what pupose, it would be a tacit acknowledgment of the authority to do so, of those who had called the Meeting; and it confined itself, therefore, to simply protesting against the entire proceedings, as disorderly and revolutionary, without appearing to have remembered that political revolutions never move backward, voluntarily; and that there was not the slightest reason for supposing that, in that particular instance, in the absence of all restraint, there would be an exception to that general law. Whether the majority, in that instance, acted wisely or unwisely, is a question which the reader must determine for himself: it is not, in the slightest degree, probable, however, that the great movement which was then in progress, and which ended only in the entire separation of the thirteen Colonies from the Mother Country, was either assisted or obstructed, in the slightest degree, by that peculiar opposition, from the conservative yeomanry of Westchester-county.

The Provincial Convention duly assembled at the Exchange, in the City of New York, on the twentieth of April, 1775, the Counties of New York, Albany, Ulster, Orange, Westchester, Duchess, Kings, Suffolk, and two Towns in Queens, being, more or less, represented by Delegates—of the Delegation which had

[1] Vide pages 40, 42, ante.

[2] The "RESOLVES," referred to in the text, are undoubtedly those which were re-produced on page 43, ante. They originated in Duchess-county, which, at that time, extended, southward, to Westchester-county; and it is understood that they were widely circulated throughout the former County, and, to a considerable extent, throughout Westchester-county.

[3] This very important paper was published in *Rivington's New-York Gazetteer*, No. 165, NEW-York, Thursday, April 20, 1775, and, in Gaine's *New-York Gazette; and the Weekly Mercury*, No. 1227, NEW-YORK, Monday, April 17th, 1775.

The entire paper, including the signatures, as they appear in the text, was very carefully copied from the original publication, in *Rivington's New-York Gazetteer*, already referred to.

Those who are familiar with the history of Westchester-county will recognize, among the signers to this *Protest*, members of a great number of the leading families of that ancient County.

been elected by the Meeting at the White Plains, all were present, except Colonel James Holmes and Jonathan Platt.

After spending nearly two days in the adjustment of its, sometimes, very questionable membership,[1] Isaac Low and John Haring, who had been members of the preceding Congress, having declined re-elections, the Convention adopted a Resolution re-electing Philip Livingston, James Duane, John Jay, and John Alsop, all of the City of New York; Simon Boerum, of Kings-county; William Floyd, of Suffolk; and Henry Wisner, of Orange-county; all of whom had been Members of that Congress; and added to them, Colonel Philip Schuyler, of Albany-county; George Clinton, of Ulster-county; Colonel Lewis Morris, of Westchester-county; Robert R. Livingston, Junior, of Duchess county; and Francis Lewis, of the City of New York; as Delegates from the Colony of New York to the second Congress of the Continent; and, on Saturday, the twenty-second of April, after the Credentials of the Delegates-elect had been signed by every member of the Convention,[2] that body having been called for the single purpose of electing Delegates to the Congress, it was adjourned, *sine die*.[3]

The movement of the Royal troops from Boston to Concord; the reckless slaughter of unresisting Colonists who had assembled on the Green, at Lexington, and of those who were retiring from that place;[4] the destruction of the Provincial stores, at Concord; the collision of the raiders with the excited Colonists, while on their retreat, from Concord to Boston; the disastrous result of that retreat; the intense excitement into which the entire Continent was consequently plunged; the entire disregard of the Royal authority, in the City of New York, which immediately followed; the temporary fortification of the pass, at Kingsbridge; and the control, within the City, which the Committee of Inspection necessarily assumed, are, all of them, matters of history, known to all intelligent persons, and need not be repeated, in this place.

The intelligence of that commencement of military operations, in the field, was received in the City of New York, on Sunday, the twenty-third of April;[5] and, at a Meeting of the Committee of Inspection, on the following Wednesday, that body, among other proceedings, resolved that "this Committee is further "unanimously of opinion, that, at the present alarm-"ing juncture, it is highly advisable that a Provincial "Congress be immediately summoned; and that it be "recommended to the Freeholders and Freemen of "this City and County, to choose, at the same time "that they vote for the new Committee aforesaid,[6] "twenty Deputies to represent them at the said Con-"gress; and that a Letter be forthwith prepared and "despatched to all the Counties, requesting them to "unite with us in forming a Provincial Congress, and "to appoint their Deputies without delay, to meet at "New York, on Monday, the twenty-second of May "next."[7]

[1] Among the very paltry *Credentials* which were generally presented by those who aspired to seats in that Convention, those which were presented by Robert R. Livingston, Junior, Egbert Benson, and Morris Graham—the latter a kinsman of the Morrises of Morrisania—were decidedly the shabbiest. Through them, however, a Livingston and a Benson crept into place and authority.

[2] The peculiar words with which those *Credentials* closed, very clearly indicate the political status of the Colony, at the date of that Convention. They were these . . . "were unanimously elected Delegates to represent "this Colony at such Congress, with full power to them or any five of "them, to meet the Delegates from the other Colonies and to concert "and determine upon such measures as shall be judged most effectual "for the preservation and re-establishment of American Rights and "Privileges, and for the restoration of harmony between Great Britain "and the Colonies."—(*Journal of the Convention*, "Die Sabatti, 11 hora "a. m. April, 22nd, 1775.")

[3] The *Journal* of this, the first, Provincial Convention of the Colony, was "printed in pursuance of a Resolution of the Legislature," in 1842; and it has been our authority, in whatever has been stated, in the text, concerning that body.

See, also, de Lancey's *Notes* to Jones's *History of New York during the Revolutionary War*, i., 486, 487; Pitkin's *History of the United States*, i., 325; Hildreth's *History of the United States*, First Series, iii., 72; etc.

Judge Jones, (*History of New York*, i., 38, 39,) strangely supposed the Members to the Congress were elected by the several Counties—those from the City of New York, at that promiscuous mass Meeting, at the Exchange, of which an account has been already presented. Bancroft, with all the authorities before him, (*History of the United States*, original edition, vi., 283; *the same*, centenary edition, iv., 513,) made all "the ru-"ral Counties," without exception, "co-operate with the City," in electing the Deputies, although Richmond, all of Queens except two Towns, Tyron, Cumberland and Charlotte-counties, made no pretension to send Deputies. He said, also, that all the members of the former Congress, "except the luke-warm Isaac Low," were re-elected; both Isaac Low and John Haring, both of them members of that Congress, declined re-elections, notwithstanding the Convention desired to return them. Lossing, (*Field-Book of the Revolution*,) appears to have regarded the action of New York, concerning the Second Congress, as too insignificant to be worthy of even a passing allusion.

[4] Notwithstanding the unaccountable display of armed men, on the Green, no attempt whatever was made, by any of them, to *oppose the march* of the Royal Troops; and when they were ordered to disperse, they did disperse, all of them seeking safety in running away, as fast as they could go. While they were thus running away, the Royal troops opened a fire on them, with the result which is known to the world. It is positively and authoritatively stated, that, with the exception, the only exception, of one, who, when "he was at some "distance"—out of harm's way—turned and "gave them the guts "of his gun," not a single gun was fired by the Colonists. Those curious to learn more on that subject—that "Battle" in which one of the parties did ALL the firing, and the other all the RUNNING—may find the testimony in Dawson's *Battles of the United States by Sea and Land*, Article "LEXINGTON AND CONCORD;" Force's *American Archives*, Fourth Series, ii., 489–501; etc.

[5] The most graphic account of the proceedings, in the City of New-York, on that memorable Sunday, as far as we have knowledge of the subject, is that presented by Judge Jones, in his *History of New York during the Revolutionary War*, (i., 39–41.)

[6] The Committee of Inspection had recommended the dissolution of that Committee, because it was invested with powers respecting only the "*Association*" of the Continental Congress; and it had also recommended the election of a new Committee of one hundred persons, thirty-three of whom should be a quorum, all of whom should retire and the Committee be "dissolved within a fortnight next after the end of the "next Session of the Continental Congress."

The "Committee of One hundred," which was thus called, subsequently became the Local Committee of the Revolutionary element, in the City of New York, and well known to every student of the history of that period.

[7] Minutes of the Committee of Inspection, "Wednesday, April 26, "1775."

Inasmuch as the City and, to a considerable extent, the Colony were practically in a state of anarchy, the Colonial Government being confessedly unable to do anything, even for the maintenance of a shadow of its official dignity and authority,[1] the calmness and ability with which the Committee controlled the excitable masses, within the City—those who had been schooled, for many years, in acts of lawless violence and destruction, and whose organization and leadership had not been disturbed,—were peculiarly noteworthy and entitled to the highest praise; and, under the circumstances which then existed, which clearly indicated that the Colonial General Assembly would not re-assemble on the third of May, to which day it had adjourned, there was an existing necessity that some other body, possessing a general influence, should be assembled, in its stead, for the control of the excited revolutionary elements, if not to lead them; and the call for a Provincial Congress, thus published, was, therefore, under the existing circumstances, both prudent and praiseworthy.

It is proper, however, that notice should be taken, in this connection, of the fact that, during the entire period preceding the publication of that call for a Provincial Congress, there had been a wholesome fear, among all classes, unless the most radical and reckless, that such a body, called and organized without warrant in law and liable to become controlled by those who would be inclined to resort to the most violent measures, notwithstanding the pretensions and professions of those who promoted the call for such a body, would soon become more oppressive than the Colonial Government, administered agreeably to law, by the legally constituted officers, had ever been or could thenceforth become. They referred, especially, in support of their fears, to the Colony of South Carolina, where such a Congress had superseded the Colonial Legislature; and they called attention to the fact that, there, the entire machinery of the Colonial Government had been stopped; the Courts had been closed; and decrees of the most oppressive character had been enacted; and these, not by the Colonial Government nor by those who were peculiarly supporters of the authority of the King, but by those who had assumed to lead the popular movement, who had utilized the project of a Provincial Convention or Congress as a more powerful instrumentality for the acquirement of authority which they had not previously possessed, for the establishment of systems of government which were neither practical nor useful, and for the gratification of malice and revenge, between individuals and communities, all of them done, too, in the name of "Liberty" and the "Rights of the "Colonies," with violent denunciations of tyranny and official oppression, *per se*, and with solemn appeals to Heaven, as guaranties of the self-assumed righteousness and of the good intentions of the self-constituted and lawless oppressors.[2] Reference was also made to other instances, in other Colonies, in which the revolutionary elements, regardless of all law, human or divine, and governed only by their own unbridled wills and for their own individual purposes, had become more oppressive than those Colonial Governments had been, against whom the full force of the revolutionary opposition had been so noisily hurled; and it was peculiarly noticeable, in the greater number, if not in all, such instances, that the most violent and lawless of those who were most reckless of the rights of individuals, were those demagogues who, previously to the uprising, had been most unmindful of the complaints of the masses—those of the "poor reptiles" of their estimates—and most sycophantic in their zeal for the promotion of the pretensions of the Colonial and Home Governments.

That serious distrust, among thoughtful men, to

[2] Judge Jones, who was on the Bench of the Supreme Court of the Colony, said that a meeting of His Majesty's Council was held at Lieutenant-governor Colden's house, on the afternoon of that Sunday which has been made memorable, in history; and that the Judges of the Supreme Court of the Colony, the Attorney-general of the Colony, the Mayor and Recorder of the City, and the Field-officers of the City Militia, were present, on invitation. "The Governor desired their advice in the "then critical situation of affairs. Several things were mentioned, pro-"posed, agitated, and talked of, but to little purpose. A Judge of the "Supreme Court," [*Thomas Jones, who wrote this statement.*] "then "present, boldly proposed that the Militia should be called out, the "Riot Act read, and if the mob did not thereupon disperse, to apprehend "and imprison the ringleaders, and by such coercive means to secure "the peace of the City. This proposal was instantly opposed by William "Smith, one of his Majesty's Council, who openly declared 'that the "'ferment which then raged in the City was general and not confined to "'a few; that it was owing to a design in the British Ministry to en-"'slave the Colonies, and to carry such design into execution by dint of "'a military force; that the Battle of Lexington was looked upon as "'a prelude to such intention; and that the spirit then prevailing in "'the Town (which he represented as universal) would subside as soon "'as the grievances of the people were redressed; and advised to let "'the populace act as they pleased'—Noisely replied, the times were "critical. A declaration of one's sentiments might be dangerous, the "Council broke up, and nothing was done."—(*History of New York during the Revolutionary War*, i. 41.)

[1] The Provincial Congress of South Carolina assembled at Charleston, on Wednesday, the eleventh of January, 1775, and adjourned on Tuesday, the seventeenth of the same month. Besides approving the doings of the Continental Congress, it forbade the commencement of any Action for Debt, and the prosecution of any such Action as had been commenced since the preceding September, unless with the consent of the Committee of the Parish in which the Defendant resided; "that "Seizures and Sales upon Mortgages should be considered on the same "footing as Actions for Debts;" "that no Summons should be issued "by any Magistrate, in small and mean Causes, without the like con-"sent of the Parish Committee;" that "compensation should be made "by those who raise articles which may be exported" [*which, agreeably to the Association of the Continental Congress, was only Rice*] "to those "who cannot raise such articles, for the losses which they may sustain "by not exporting the commodities they raise;" "that if the Exportation "of Rice should be continued" [*under the exception, in its favor, which the Continental Congress had made*] "one-third of the Rice made in the "Colony should be deposited in the hands of Committees" appointed to receive it, for the public use, at prices named by the Congress, and payable in the paper currency of the Colony, which was depreciated to seven for one of specie; and other decrees of the most oppressive characters.

Descriptions of that Provincial Congress and of its remarkable methods and still more remarkable doings, may be seen in Ramsay's *History of the Revolution in South Carolina*, i., 23-25; Drayton's *Memoirs of the American Revolution as relating to South Carolina*, i., 166-180; etc.

See, also, *Journal of the Congress*, re-printed in Force's *American Archives*, Fourth Series, i., 1109-1118.

which reference has been made in connection with the call for a Provincial Congress, was greatly strengthened, immediately after the receipt of the intelligence of the military expedition to Concord, and in the midst of the intense excitement which then prevailed throughout the City, by the inroad into the County of Westchester and the City of New York, of a large number of men, from Connecticut, who had come on their own motion, unsolicited by any one in New York or elsewhere; without the slightest authority from the Government of their own Colony; and, evidently, bent on nothing else than to be present to share in the distribution of the booty which an evidently expected general overturning of the homes and the business-offices and warehouses of that City would have placed within their reach. They lived, on their way through Westchester-county as well as while they were within the City, entirely on their wits and on the products of their wits, professing to have come only "with a view of aiding and assisting "us in preparing for our defense;" but their reckless arrogance and audacity, in their assumption of authority in local affairs as well as in other matters, in which they were evidently sustained by some of the more desperate of the leaders of the revolutionary faction, in the City of New York, which were made matters of record, had they not been only earlier specimens of the peculiarly "New England ideas" which, subsequently, became so common and so well known, would have been regarded, by those of later periods, as unaccountable, if not impossible.[1] Thoughtful men, therefore, had abundant reason for reflection; and men of property needed to provide for the security of their possessions; and peaceful men and heads of families did well, when they sought shelter in distant parts of the country, while there were so many and such portentous warnings of the ills which were so evidently and so rapidly approaching.

The excitement and bitterness of factional strife, not always of a purely political character, with which the City of New York had been unceasingly afflicted, during several years preceding the period now under consideration, had tended to the serious disturbance of the individual and social relations of many of those who lived in that City; and the political annals of that period afford ample testimony to the fact that terrorism, there, one of the reasonable results of the existing excitement, was prevalent, audacious, and unchecked by those in authority. The County of Westchester, in her rural contentment, as has been seen in other portions of this narrative, had continued, during the entire period of that earlier revolutionary era, in the City of New York, to enjoy peace and good-will among her inhabitants; but the Meeting at the White Plains, on the eleventh of April, and the military Expedition to Concord, on the nineteenth of that month, with their respective trains of discord and malevolence, appear to have rapidly disturbed that quiet and neighborly feeling which had previously prevailed, and to have originated that reign of terror, throughout that County, which, subsequently, distinguished it so highly in the annals of partisan strife. History has recorded two notable instances of that rapidly developed, so called, "public opinion," among the new-born and, consequently, unnaturally zealous "fire-eaters" of that ancient and orderly County; and they may properly find attention, at this time, not only as portions of the history of Westchester-county, during the era of the American Revolution, but as instances of the dangers which attend an unchecked zeal, even when exercised in behalf of what may be regarded as purely commendable purposes.

The first of these acts of terrorism, exercised by the rampant revolutionary elements in Westchester-county, was that in the case of Jonathan Fowler and George Cornwell, two respectable residents of the County, both of whom had signed the *Declaration and Protest*, at the White Plains, on the eleventh of April, as well as the *Resolves* which were referred to, in that *Declaration and Protest*, both of whom were compelled by that, so called, "public opinion," to publish a recantation of their evidently well-considered political opinions, which was done in the following words, carefully copied from the original publication, in Gaine's *New-York Gazette: and the Weekly Mercury*, No. 1229, NEW-YORK, Monday, May 1, 1775:

"TO THE PRINTER.

"WE the subscribers do hereby make this public Declaration, That whereas we "and several others in Westchester-County, having "signed a certain Number of Resolves, which at the "Time of our said signing, we deemed Constitutional, "and as having a Tendency to promote the Interest "of our Country; but since, upon mature Deliberation, and more full Knowledge of the Matter, find "not only injurious to our present Cause, but likewise offensive to our Fellow Colonists. We do "therefore thus publicly testify our Abhorrence of "the same, and declare ourselves Friends to the Colonies, and ever ready cheerfully to exert ourselves "in the Defence and Preservation of the same.

"JONATHAN FOWLER, Esq.
"GEORGE CORNWELL, Esq.

"29th April, 1775."

As both the signers of that recantation were evidently intelligent men, one of them having been, at that time, one of the Judges of the Court of Common Pleas of the County, it is not probable that they had signed those *Resolves*—no mention having been made of the *Declaration and Protest*—without having understood the effect of their action on "the common cause;"

[1] *Proceedings of the Committee of One hundred*, Adjourned Meeting, May 3, 1775; *Locke's Memoir of General John Lamb*, 105; etc.

and the offence which they had given to their neighbors, or to such of them as could inflict injury on them or on their property, was clearly the cause which produced their recantation.

The second of those acts of terrorism, to which reference has been made, was that in the case of Isaac Wilkins, that leading Member of the General Assembly of the Colony, in its contest with the Home Government; that very able "A. W. FARMER" who, with his pen, had aroused so much indignation; and that spokesman of the protestants, at the Meeting at the White Plains, with whom the reader is well acquainted. That gentleman, in order to secure his personal safety, was compelled to abandon his home and family, and to take refuge in England. On the eve of his departure, while he was in the City of New York, he wrote the following touching address to his countrymen, which has been carefully copied from *Rivington's New-York Gazetteer*, No. 108, NEW-YORK, Thursday, May 11, 1775:

"MY COUNTRYMEN:

"Before I leave America, the land I love, and in "which is contained everything that is valuable and "dear to me, my wife, my children, my friends, and "property; permit me to make a short and faithful "declaration, which I am induced to do neither "through fear, nor a consciousness of having acted "wrong. An honest man, and a Christian, hath nothing to apprehend from this world. God is my judge, "and God is my witness, that all I have done, written, "or said, in relation to the present unnatural dispute "between Great Britain and her Colonies, proceeded "from an honest intention of serving my country. "Her welfare and prosperity were the objects towards "which all my endeavours have been directed. They "are still the sacred objects which I shall ever steadily and invariably keep in view: And when in "England, all the influence that so inconsiderable "a man as I am, can have, shall be exerted in her "behalf.

"It has been my constant maxim through life, to "do my duty conscientiously, and to trust the issue of "my actions to the Almighty.—May that God in "whose hands are all events, speedily restore peace "and liberty to my unhappy country. May Great-"Britain and America be soon united in the bands of "everlasting amity: and when united, may they continue a free, a virtuous, and happy nation to the "end of time.

"I leave America, and every endearing connection, "because I will not raise my hand against my Sovereign,—nor will I draw my sword against my Country; when I can conscientiously draw it in her "favour, my life shall be chearfully devoted to her "service.

"ISAAC WILKINS.

"NEW YORK,
"May 3, 1775."

While these unwelcome features of the political movements, in Westchester-county, were extending over the entire community, Lewis Morris was busily employed, after his seat in the forthcoming Congress of the Colonies had been secured beyond a peradventure, in an attempt to belittle the *Declaration and Protest* of those, at the White Plains, who had objected to the proceedings of the Meeting of which he was, there, the manager and Chairman. For that purpose, on the seventh of May, he prepared an elaborate reply, which, a few days afterwards, with some other historical material, he gave to the newspapers, for publication. As an important portion of the local literature of Westchester-county, of that period, it may properly find a place in this work. The following is a carefully prepared copy of it:

"To the PUBLIC.

"A Very extraordinary paper, called a protest against the proceedings of the Freeholders "of the county of West-Chester, relative to the elec-"tion of deputies for the late Convention, and said to "have been subscribed by the several persons whose "names are printed with it, was published in Mess. "Rivington and Gaine's Gazetteers, a few weeks "ago.

"By whom this performance was given to the pub-"lic, is uncertain, and being as little distinguished by "decency as by truth, there is reason to suspect, the "author's name will remain a secret.

"The falsities contained in this representation, are "too flagrant to impose upon any person in this col-"ony, and nothing but the apprehension of its gain-"ing credit in other parts of the world, would have "induced me to have made it the subject of ani-"madversion.

"I shall pass over the many little embellishments "with which the author's fancy has endeavoured to "decorate his narrative; nor is it necessary to call in "question the reality of that loyal enthusiasm, by "which it was said these good people were influenced; "and I really wish it had been the fact, because when "inconsistencies and fooleries result from inebriety or "enthusiasm, they merit our pity, and escape indig-"nation and resentment.

"Much pains, I confess, were on that day taken to "make temporary enthusiasts, and with other more "*exhilirating spirit*, than the spirit of loyalty.

"To give the appearance of dignity to these curious "and very orderly protestors, the author has been "very mindful to annex every man's addition to his "name, upon a presumption perhaps that it would "derive weight from the title of *Mayor, Esquire, Cap-"tain, Lieutenant, Judge*, &c.

"But it is not easy to conceive why the publisher "should be less civil to the *Clergy* than to the *gentry* "and *commonalty*, *Samuel Seabury* and *Luke Babcock*, "certainly ought not to have been sent into the world "floating on a news paper in that *plain* way,—the

"one is the REVEREND *Mr. Samuel Seabury, Rector of* "*the united parishes of East and West-Chester, and one* "*of the Missionaries for propagating the* GOSPEL, *and* "*not* POLITICKS, *in foreign parts*, &c., &c., *the other is* "*the Reverend Mr. Luke Babcock, who preaches and* "*prays for Col. Philips and his tenants at Philipsburg.*

"In this formidable catalogue of 312 sober and loyal "protestors, there are not less than one hundred and "seventy, who after a most diligent enquiry, I cannot "find have the least pretensions to a vote, and indeed "many of them are lads under age. Their names are "as follows:

"'Samuel Seabury,	Timothy Purdy,
"'Luke Babcock,	James M'Guire,
"'Benjamin Fowler, Esq.	James Regnaw,
"'Joshua Pell,	Samuel Purdy,
"'Edward Pell,	Sylvanus Purdy,
"'John Hunt,	William Dalton,
"'Gilbert Horton,	Elijah Tomkins,
"'Adrian Leforge,	Charles Lawrence,
"'Moses Williams,	Joshua Purdy, junr.
"'Philip Kelley,	James Sniffen, junr.
"'James Hains, jun.	Peter Bonet,
"'Matthew Hains,	Peter Fashee,
"'Bartholomew Hains,	Jesse Lawrence,
"'John Hains,	William Sniden,
"'Elijah Hains,	Solomon Dean,
"'Joseph Clark,	Thomas Hiat,
"'Joseph Oakly,	William Woodward,
"'James Mott,	John Whitmore,
"'Daniel Purdy,	William Underhill,
"'John Crab,	Nehemiah Tomkins,
"'Izariah Whitmore,	Henry Leforge,
"'Absalom Gidney,	Evert Brown,
"'John Brown,	Benjamin Beyea,
"'Jasper Stivers,	John Loree,
"'Peter M'Farthing,	Elnathan Appleby,
"'Joshua Purdy, jun.	John Baker,
"'Haccaliah Purdy, jun.	Jonathan Underhill,
"'James Tomkins,	James M'Chain,
"'Gilbert Thial,	Joshua Hunt,
"'William Sexen,	Bates Chatterdon,
"'Thomas Champeniers,	William Londrine,
"'John Champeniers,	Dennis Kennedy,
"'Eliazer Hart,	James Hains,
"'James Hunt,	Andrew Bainton,
"'Joshua Parker,	Nathaniel Tomkins,
"'Joshua Barnes,	Caleb Archer,
"'John Park,	Benjamin Bugbe,
"'Samuel Purdy,	Francis Purdy,
"'Gilbert Purdy,	William Odell,
"'James Chatterton,	Israel Hunt,
"'Thomas Cromwell,	Thomas Tomkins,
"'Solomon Horton,	Frederick Underhill,
"'Nathaniel Underhill, jun.	Peter Post,
"'Philip Fowler,	Benjamin M'Cord,
"'John M'Farthing,	John Williams,
"'Jacob Post,	John Ackeman,
"'James Baxter,	Peter Rusting,
"'John Hart,	Jeremiah Hunter,
"'Cornelius Losee,	Abraham Storm,
"'Jesse Park,	Peter Jenning,
"'Roger Purdy, jun.	John Gale,
"'Gilbert Pugsley,	John Smith,
"'Abraham Ledian,	James Hart, junr.
"'Benjamin Brown,	Jonathan Purdy, junr.
"'Aaron Buis,	Monmouth Hart, junr.
"'John Baizley,	Christopher Purdy,
"'David Oakley, jun.	Gabriel Purdy,
"'Isaac Smith,	Edward Merrit, junr.
"'John Hyatt,	Henry Bisborough,
"'Abraham Odell,	William Van Wart,
"'Thomas Lawrence,	Abraham Storm,
"'John Seyson,	Thomas Berry,
"'Isaac Forshen,	Charles Merit,
"'Gabriel Requeaw,	Benjamin Griffen,
"'Gabriel Archer,	James Angevine,
"'Elias Secord,	Jeremiah Anderson, junr.
"'James Peirce,	William Barker, junr.
"'Edward Bugbe,	Gideon Arden,
"'Daniel Haight,	Joshua Purdy,
"'John Hunt, junr.	George Storm,
"'Abraham Losee,	Jacob Vermiller,
"'Isaac Tomkins,	Samuel Heusted,
"'Joseph Paulding,	John Warner,
"'Hendrieus Storm,	John Storm,
"'Francis Secord,	Joshua Secord,
"'John Parker,	John Underhill,
"'Gilbert Bates,	William Underhill, junr.
"'David Purdy,	James Hill,
"'David Bleecker,	William Watkins,
"'Jordan Downing,	Richard Baker,
"'Corn. Van Tassell,	Bishop Heustice,
"'Joseph Appleby,	Jeremiah Hitchcock,
"'Patrick Cary,	William Bond,
"'Gilbert Ward,	Samuel Sneden,
"'William Dunlap,	Joshua Ferriss.'

"Of the others who are Freeholders, many also "hold lands at *will* of *Col. Philips*, so that the truth "really is, that very few independent Freeholders ob-"jected to the appointment of Deputies.

"LEWIS MORRIS.

"MORRISANIA,
"May 7, 1775."[1]

It will be seen that, with more than his usual shrewdness, Lewis Morris postponed his attempt to reply to the *Declaration and Protest* which had been made, some weeks previously, by those who had objected to the Meeting at the White Plains, until after his brother-in-law, Isaac Wilkins, who had led those protestants, and who was known to have been the

[1] This notable paper, except the list of names, was published in *Rivington's New-York Gazetteer*, No. 108, NEW-YORK, Thursday, May 11, 1775; and the names were published in the next number of that paper—No. 109, NEW-YORK, Thursday, May 18, 1775; the text of the article was published in Gaine's *New-York Gazette: and the Weekly Mercury*, No. 1231, NEW-YORK, Monday, May 15, 1775—although promise was made that the names should be published in the succeeding number, they were not—and both the text of the article and the names appear in Holt's *New-York Journal*, No. 1689, NEW-YORK, May 18, 1775.

From the first-named of those two papers, the re-print of it, in the text, was very carefully made.

author of their *Declaration and Protest*, had left America, when he knew that he was probably secured from challenge concerning the untruthfulness of whatever he should write, in that reply—neither Samuel Seabury nor Luke Babcock had written anything concerning the political questions of that period;[1] it was not thought they would do so; and there was no other person, in Westchester-county, whose pen promised trouble to the new-made leader, no matter how much that peculiar failing which had made his family conspicuous, throughout the Colony,[2] should be manifested in whatever he should write.

The relative merits of the two papers, the *Declaration and Protest* and the reply, will be very readily seen, by every careful reader. The author of the latter was very profuse in his very general charge of "falsities contained in this representation;" but he failed to specify, even a single instance in which the former had presented an untruth; and every one will perceive that he did not except, from the general impeachment, even those portions of the *Declaration and Protest* which agreed, in their recital of facts, with his own statement of those facts, contained in the official report of the proceedings of that Meeting, at the White Plains, written over his own signature, on the afternoon of the day on which the Meeting was held, and subsequently presented by him, to the Provincial Convention, as the Credentials through which he and his associates were admitted to seats in that body, as, nominally, a delegation from Westchester-county—if the recital contained in the one was untruthful, therefore, the similar recital contained in the other was, necessarily, quite as untrustworthy as the other. He also impeached the "decency" of what the *Declaration and Protest* contained; but, again, he failed to specify in what their "indecency" consisted. He impeached the *bona fide* of the "enthusiasm" of the protestants, at the Plains; but he "confessed," and only those who are guilty "confess," that his own companions, those who had given the much coveted place and authority to him, were also noisy, from the effects of other Spirits than that of loyalty to the King—inasmuch as each of the two factions, at the Plains, claimed to have been noisy as well as loyal, the author of the reply had little reason for making such an objection, unless he desired to secure to his own faction the credit of making all the noise and of expressing all the loyalty which were then produced, by any one. He objected, also, that the titles of those who had signed the *Declaration and Protest* were appended to the names of those to whom they respectively belonged; but a reference to the official report of the proceedings of that Meeting, signed by himself and evidently from his own pen, to which reference has been made, will show to any one that the specific titles of "Mr.," "Esq.," "Captain," "Major," and "Colonel," were added to eighteen of the twenty-six names which that report contained—indeed, he had given the distinctive title of "Colonel," to himself, in three different places, in that report; and that, too, without a word of apology. He *insinuated* that one hundred and seventy of those who had signed the *Protest* were not voters—"after the most diligent inquiry, "I cannot find they have the least pretensions to "vote," he said; adding, "and indeed, many of them "are lads under age"—but he conveniently omitted to make a direct and positive averment of such a want of qualification, in any one of those protestants; and he also conveniently failed to designate which of the one hundred and seventy whom he named, in any single instance, was a minor. Most of all, he disregarded the fact that the *Declaration and Protest*, to which he assumed to make a reply, had made no pretension to having been made exclusively by "Freeholders," but, on the contrary, it was thus headed: "We the subscribers, freeholders *and inhabitants* of "the county of Westchester, having assembled at the "White Plains, in consequence of certain advertisements," etc., from which every appearance of exclusiveness, in the signers of it, was expressly excluded. Finally: he impeached the "independence" of those of the signers of that *Protest* who were Freeholders, by saying "many also hold lands at will under Col. Philips;" but he conveniently forgot to tell how a mere tenant at will could, thereby, become a Freeholder, or how many, in the Manor of Cortlandt, who were only tenants or who held lands at the will of the Proprietors of that Manor, had been induced by other causes than loyalty to those Proprietors or discontent with the General Assembly, to go to the White Plains, to assist into a place in the revolutionary organization, the young member of that "patriotic" family, Philip, on whom, a few months before, the Royal Governor, William Tryon, had bestowed a Royal Commission of Major, which he then bore; nor was it convenient for the author of that reply, to state, therein, just how many of the tenants and other retainers of the lordly Lord of the Manor of Morrisania had been induced, contrary to their unassisted inclinations, to ride from the Borough Town of Westchester to the White Plains, on that eleventh of April, to assist in the elevation of himself into an office, no matter what. The character of Colonel Frederic Philipse, whom he was so swift to impeach, whether regarded as a man or as a gentleman, as a landlord or as a citizen, was quite as pure, and quite as upright, and quite as worthy of

[1] Mr. Seabury, in his *Memorial to the General Assembly of Connecticut*, presented on the twentieth of December, 1775, in reply to one of the four accusations which had been made against him, expressly stated that he had not, at that time, written any "pamphlets and newspapers "against the liberties of America;" which effectually disproves much that has been written, on that subject, by modern bibliographers.

[2] "This family are so remarkable for '*enlarging the truth*,' that all "stories suspected of not being true are known throughout the County "of Westchester, in the City of New York, and on the westernmost part "of Long Island, by the name of 'Morrisanias.'"—(Jones's *History of New York during the Revolutionary War*, i., 140.)

respect, as was that of Colonel Lewis Morris or that of any other member of that unpopular family; and his practises, in private and in public life, against which not even a Morris, in his bitterest mood, could say a word of open disrespect, merited no such thing from the office-seeking head of the small, new-born revolutionary faction, then in Westchester-county—from one whose only antagonism to the Colonial and Home Governments originated in and was sustained by the continued ill-success of the family of which he was the head, in its unceasing hankering for that official station from which, except in a single notorious instance, the controlling power within the Colony, for many years, had rigidly excluded it.

At the same time, and through the same public press in which Lewis Morris published his reply to the *Declaration and Protest*, to which reference has been made, he also published the following Cards,[1] evidently the only trophies of the kind, which he had secured, during the political campaign in which he had been engaged, since the publication of the *Declaration and Protest* had aroused his indignation, and the withdrawal of his brother-in-law had left him without an opponent:

I

"That our names were not subscribed to the "protest of West-Chester, either by our-"selves, or our orders or permission, directly or indi-"rectly, is certified by us, each for himself.

"PETER BUSSING.
"PETER BUSSING, jun.

"May 4, 1775."

II

"MR. RIVINGTON,

"I Did sign a protest, which was printed in your "paper; but I did so, because I was told that the in-"tent of signing it was to shew, that I was for the "liberties of the country.

"SAMUEL BAKER."

III

"NORTH-CASTLE, May 8, 1775.

"MR. RIVINGTON,

"IN your paper lately I saw my name to a pro-"test. I never signed it, but went into Capt. "Hatfield's house, and was asked, whether I was a "Whig or a Tory? I made answer, that I did not "understand the meaning of those words, but was for "liberty and peace. Upon which somebody put down "my name. Now, Sir, I desire that you will print "this to shew to the world, that I have not deserved "to be held up in the light of a protestor.

"JEREMIAH HUNTER."

With these four publications—the reply to the *Declaration and Protest* and the three Cards of recantation—as far as Westchester-county was concerned, the literature of the first Provincial Convention of the Colony of New York ended—and, as every farmer had returned to his rural home, at the close of the eventful eleventh of April, and had resumed his work, the necessary work of the season, on his farm or on the river, with the exceptions, here and there, of a disturbed mind, an angry thought, or an unneighborly resentment, new features in the social life of Westchester-county farmers, the whole subject gradually became a thing of the past, fit only for material for history.

Reference has been made to the action of the Committee of Inspection, in the City of New York, on the twenty-sixth of April, providing for its own dissolution; for the election of a new Committee of one hundred, to occupy its place, in that City; and for the organization of a Provincial Congress, with general authority for the government of the entire Colony.[2] For the accomplishment of the last-named of those purposes, a Circular Letter was addressed, by the Chairman of that Committee, to the Committees of those Counties in which Committees had been chosen, and to prominent residents of those Counties in which Committees had not been chosen, inviting their co-operation, and recommending them to choose Deputies to the proposed Congress, the following being a copy of that Circular Letter:

"CIRCULAR.

"COMMITTEE CHAMBER, NEW-YORK, April 28, 1775.

"GENTLEMEN,

"The distressed and alarming situation of our "Country, occasioned by the sanguinary measures "adopted by the British Ministry, (to enforce which, "the Sword has been actually drawn against our "brethren in the Massachusetts), threatening to "involve this Continent in all the horrors of a civil "War, obliges us to call for the united aid and council "of the Colony, at this dangerous crisis.

"Most of the Deputies who composed the late "Provincial Congress, held in this City, were only "vested with powers to chose Delegates to represent "the Province at the next Continental Congress, "and the Convention having executed that trust "dissolved themselves: It is therefore thought "adviseable by this Committee, that a Provincial "Congress be immediately summoned to deliberate "upon, and from time to time to direct such measures "as may be expedient for our common safety.

"We persuade ourselves, that no argument can

[1] *Rivington's New-York Gazetteer*, No. 108, NEW-YORK, Thursday, May 11, 1775.

Any one who is acquainted with the habits of printers, in "making "up" the forms of a newspaper, for the press, will understand, from the places which these three Cards, and the reply of Lewis Morris to the *Declaration and Protest* (omitting the names), and the proceedings of the Meeting at the White Plains—five distinct articles relating to Westchester-county—occupy, together, in the last Column of the inside form of the paper, that they all proceeded from the same hand; and that the three Cards of recanting protesters were, evidently, among the results of Lewis Morris's political pilgrimage through that County, in his diligent search for protestants who were not, also, Freeholders.

[1] *Vide* Page 75, *ante*.

"now be wanting to evince the necessity of a perfect "union; and we know of no method in which "the united sense of the people of the province can "be collected, but the one now proposed. We there-"fore entreat your County heartily to unite in the "choice of proper persons to represent them at a "Provincial Congress to be held in this City on the "22d of May next.—Twenty Deputies are proposed "for this City, and in order to give the greater weight "and influence to the councils of the Congress, we "could wish the number of Deputies from the "counties, may be considerable.

"We can assure you, that the appointment of a "Provincial Congress,[1] approved of by the inhabitants "of this city in general, is the most proper and "salutary measure that can be adopted in the present "melancholy state of this Continent; and we shall be "happy to find, that our brethren in the different "Counties concur with us in opinion.

"By order of the Committee.

"ISAAC LOW, *Chairman*."[2]

As there was not, at that time, any Committee, within the County of Westchester, unto whom that Circular Letter could be sent, it was probably sent, as that relating to the proposed Provincial Convention had been sent, to some prominent resident of that County, most convenient to the Chairman of the Committee of the City, for circulation in the several Towns, throughout the County; and, by that local politician, whomsoever he may have been, it may be reasonably supposed that those Circular Letters which were thus sent to him, were duly circulated "where they would "do the most good," for his own interest and for those of his family. It is said, however, that "a general "notice," inviting a Meeting of the Freeholders of the County, was published; and history has recorded, over the official signature of the "Chairman for the "day," that such a Meeting was held, at the White Plains, on Monday, the eighth of May, 1775, "pur-"suant to a general notice for that purpose," James Van Cortlandt, of the Borough Town of Westchester, occupying the Chair. No pretensions were made, in the official report of the Meeting or elsewhere, that the attendance was large: on the contrary, it is very probable that not more than two dozens were present. Whatever the number may have been, it assumed to be the representative of all who were, then, within the County, of every condition in life; and, in the name and in behalf of all those who then lived therein, whether present or absent, it appointed "a Committee "of ninety persons, for the said County," and determined that any twenty of them, "should be "impowered to act for the said County;" and it also determined to send a Deputation to the proposed Provincial Congress, referring to the new-appointed Committee of the County, the nomination of those who should be members of that Deputation.

There were only twenty-three of the ninety who had been named for the Committee, present and acting on the subject which had been referred to it; but it was not slow in nominating, "to represent the said "County in Provincial Convention," Gouverneur Morris, Doctor Robert Graham, Colonel Lewis Graham, and Colonel James Van Cortlandt, all of them from the Borough Town of Westchester; Stephen Ward and Joseph Drake, from Eastchester; Major Philip Van Cortlandt, of the Manor of Cortlandt; Colonel James Holmes, of Bedford; John Thomas, Junior, of Rye; David Dayton, of North Castle; and William Paulding, of ——; and, undoubtedly, with equal promptness, the Meeting confirmed the nominations, by electing the eleven nominees to seats in the proposed Congress of the Colony.

It is said, in the official report of the Meeting, that, after the election of the Deputation, as above "stated, "the Committee signed an *association*, simi-"lar to that which was signed in the city of New-"York, and appointed Sub-Committees to superintend "the signing of the same throughout the County;"[3]

[1] It will be noticed that the proposed assembly was, in this Circular Letter, called a "Provincial *Congress*," not a "*Convention*," as the last was named.

[2] The re-print of this Circular Letter, in the text, is made from a carefully-made copy of one of the originals, which has been preserved among *Associations* in the *Historical Manuscripts relating to the War of the Revolution*, in the Secretary of State's Office, at Albany, Volume XXX., Page 182.

[3] The *Association*, which was thus "signed by the Committee"—if any others than Members of the Committee had been present, they also would have signed it—was not that *Association* which the Continental Congress had decreed and promulgated, in the preceding October, but another and entirely different affair, which had been drawn up by James Duane, John Jay, and Peter Van Schaack, and "set on foot in "New-York," on the twenty-ninth of April. It had been largely signed, in the City, and copies of it had been sent "through all the "counties in the Province;" and the action taken at the White Plains, concerning it, was only responsive to the request of the Committee of One hundred, which had superseded the Committee of Inspection, in the City of New York. The following is a copy of that *Association*, carefully copied from *Rivington's New-York Gazetteer*, No. 107, NEW-YORK, Thursday, May 4, 1775:

"PERSUADED that the salvation of the rights and liberties of "America, depends, under God, on the firm union of its in-"habitants, in a vigorous prosecution of the measures necessary for its "safety, and convinced of the necessity of preventing the anarchy and "confusion which attend a dissolution of the powers of government; "we, the freemen, freeholders, and inhabitants of the city and county of "New-York, being greatly alarmed at the avowed design of the minis-"try to raise a revenue in America, and shocked by the bloody scene "now acting in the Massachusetts-Bay; do, in the most solemn manner "resolve never to become slaves; and to associate under all the ties of "religion, honour, and love to our country, to adopt, and endeavour to "carry into execution, whatever measures may be recommended by the "continental congress, or resolved upon by our provincial convention, "for the purpose of preserving our constitution, and opposing the exe-"cution of several arbitrary and oppressive acts of the British Parlia-"ment, until a reconciliation between Great Britain and America, on "constitutional principles, (which we most ardently desire) can be ob-"tained; and that we will, in all things, follow the advice of our "general committee, respecting the purposes aforesaid, the preservation "of peace and good order, and the safety of individuals and private prop-"erty.

"Dated in New-York, April and May, 1775."

This *Association*, with some slight changes, was re-printed (without any

and after that had been done, the Meeting was adjourned.[1]

The official report of the proceedings of the Meeting does not give the names of any of the ninety persons who were said to have been chosen as a "Committee for the County of Westchester;" and a careful search for those names, in other contemporary publications, has been rewarded with only a partial success—the *Credentials* of the Deputies to the Provincial Congress, to which reference has been made, reveal the names of the following:

David Dan,[2]	George Comb,
Miles Oakley,	Micah Townsend,
John G. Graham,	Benoni Platt,
Samuel Drake,	Frederic Van Cortlandt,
Lewis Morris,	James Varian,
Jonathan Platt,[3]	Samuel Haviland,
Michael Hays,	Benjamin Lyon,
Samuel Crawford,	Robert Bloomer,
Gilbert Thorn,	William Miller,
Thomas Thomas,	Joshua Ferris,
James Newman,	Gilbert Drake,
Jonathan G. Tompkins,	*Chairman.*

It will be evident to the reader that, until the appointment of the "Committee for the County of West-"chester," by the Meeting which was held at the White Plains, on the eighth of May, 1775, as has been already stated, there had not been even the slightest appearance of any central organization, for political purposes, within the County; that, until they were crowded into the political arena, by the place-seekers who were among them, the hardworking farmers throughout the County had not permitted the political questions of the day to disturb their peaceful labors; and that the place-hunting few, as insignificant in numbers as they were in honest patriotism, did not constitute even a respectable minority of those who were heads of families and householders, throughout the County.[4] It will be seen, also, that the Morris family, strengthened by its alliance with its kindred family of Graham, had fully entrenched itself, as the political head of the County; and it will be particularly noticed of what kind of material Delegates were made, even at that early period of the revolutionary movement in Westchester-county, the most ill-disguised monarchists and even office-holders holding Commissions under the Crown, from among the non-producing class in that purely agricultural community, boldly, if not audaciously, assuming to be in harmony with the industrial masses whom they really despised, and crowding forward, in their greed for place and emoluments, to seize whatever opportunity for advancement, their ingenuity and their superior intelligence should place within their reach.

If a mere handful of the inhabitants of the County, who neither possessed nor claimed to possess any legal qualifications whatever to do such an act; who did not act nor claim to act under the guidance of any thing except its own unrighteous impulses; and who neither possessed nor claimed to possess even a shadow of delegated authority from any one, within or without the County, to do any such acts or any others, with the authority and in the name of the County, can be said, with even a semblance of truth, to have really done so, the ancient and entirely conservative County of Westchester, by the revolutionary action at the Meeting at the White Plains, on the eighth of May, was wheeled into the front line of the Rebellion,

---

apparent reason) appended to the *Journal of the Provincial Convention*, which Convention had adjourned a week before the *Association* was written and before it was known that any reason for such an *Association* was imminent. In de Lancey's *Notes* to Jones's *History of New-York during the Revolutionary War*, i., 505, 506, it has been again re-printed, this time from the inaccurate re-print just referred to, and, of course, with its imperfections, together with a more serious omission than any which that had presented.

Judge Jones, in his *History of New York*, i., 41–45, gave a very interesting account of the *Association* and of the signing of it, warmly tinted, of course, with his peculiar bitterness; but, nevertheless, he is our principal authority on those subjects.

[1] This statement of the proceedings of the Meeting at which a Deputation was chosen to represent Westchester-county, in the first Provincial Congress, is made on the authority of the official report of that Meeting, signed by "JAMES VAN CORTLANDT, *Chairman for the Day*," and published in *Rivington's New-York Gazetteer*, No. 108, NEW-YORK, Thursday, May 11, 1775; and on that of the *Credentials*, signed by each of the twenty-three Members of the Committee for the County who were then present, which *Credentials* have been preserved among *Credentials of Delegates*, in the *Historical Manuscripts, relating to the War of the Revolution*, in the Secretary of State's Office at Albany, Volume XXIV., Page 123.

[2] The Provincial Congress, on the twenty-ninth of June, 1775, issued a Warrant to David Dan, as First Lieutenant, under Captain Jonathan Platt.

[3] The Provincial Congress, on the twenty-ninth of June, 1775, issued a Warrant to Jonathan Platt, as Captain.

[4] In all which has been written concerning the political affairs of Westchester-county, prior to the first Session of the First Provincial Congress, which assembled on the twenty-second of May, 1775, as far as we have knowledge on the subject, only fifty-one persons *have been named*, as residents of that County, who favored the revolutionary proceedings recommended by the Continental Congress of 1774. Of these fifty-one, two were Representatives in the General Assembly—one of them, was, then, the County Judge, under the Royal Government. Of the remaining forty-nine, one rose no higher than a place in the Committee of his Town; six were satisfied with only places on the Committee of the County, in whom, however, great power in local matters was vested, and by whom much money was disbursed for the support of prisoners of war quartered in their vicinities; one aspired to both the Town and County Committees, and held seats in both; three were given nothing else than Commissions in the Regiments of the County; eleven held various Civil Offices, as well as Commissions in the Regiments of the County; one held a seat in the Provincial Congress, and was contented with that single place; sixteen held seats in one or more of the Provincial Congresses, together with other places, at the same time or subsequently; five became discontented with their associations, and were accused of being loyalists, and were prosecuted as such; leaving only five of the entire forty-nine who did not, as far as we have knowledge, accept places of either authority or emolument. Even the Secretary of the first County Committee looked out for the profits of official station, and secured, through his associations, some of the fat things of place—Micah Townsend, the Clerk of the first County-Committee, secured the command of a Company of Colonial Troops, early in 1776; and he was, in other respects, well provided for, during that era of distress and ruin.

The reader may judge from this exhibit how much of genuine patriotism and how much of personal selfishness, controlled the revolutionary politics of Westchester-County, 1774–75.

abreast of the most advanced of the anarchists of that period; and if, without a semblance of that "consent" of which so much had been said and written, as a prerequisite to any change of government—without, also, any of those qualifications in itself and authorities from others, of which mention has been made—the same handful of new-born revolutionists, at the same time, can be said to have really done so, the allegiance of the great body of the anti-revolutionary farmers of that County, and there were no others, to its Sovereign, was violated, if not abrogated, and all the obligations of that great body of the inhabitants of the County, to obey the legally established Governments and the legally enacted Laws of the Country, were dissolved, and all were made subject, instead, to that self-constituted County Committee which was then organized and taking its first step in Rebellion; to the proposed Congress of the Colony, in whom was to be vested absolute, unrestrained authority, in all classes of governmental affairs relating only to the Colony of New York; and to the coming second Continental Congress, in whom, also, a similarly absolute, unrestrained authority, on every conceivable subject, within each and every of the several Colonies, would, also, be seated; and, therefore, every one of those peaceful and peacefully inclined farmers and every member of their respective families were, by that handful of revolutionists, insignificant in numbers and only tools in the hands of an unprincipled master mischief-maker, made subject, *nolens volens*, to every edict which should be promulgated by either of those three self-constituted, unrestrained, revolutionary bodies; to whatever they or either of them should determine, no matter how monstrous its character might be; and, very often, to whatever individual members of one or other of those bodies, intoxicated with the possession of a power to which, previously, they had been strangers and reveling in a despotism to which the Colony had not, at any period of its existence, been subjected, should demand and require.

With those partisan catchwords and political maxims which, a very short time previously, had filled the air with their noisiness, before the reader, he will readily determine how much of even revolutionary consistency and propriety and integrity there was in those doings which are now under consideration; but, among such as those by whom those doings were inaugurated and conducted—among those whose aims were only personal and selfish and wholly regardless of every other principle whatever than that of self-aggrandizement; among whom the supremacy of the general good of the great body of the Colony or of the Continent—the "patriotism" of poets, of professional politicians, and of exuberant eulogists—was only a toy intended for nothing else than for the temporary amusement of their gaping, credulous auditory, while the political prestidigitator who presided over the show, bedizened with the tinsel which was not what it seemed to be, was secretly perfecting the juggle which was intended to deceive all others than those who were participants in the performance and sharers in the profits to be derived from it,—neither consistency nor propriety nor integrity was regarded or even thought of, the cupidity of the end entirely justified the unrighteousness of the means; and new governing powers and new rules of conduct and new methods took their places in every Town, throughout the County; and old obligations were disregarded, and old guaranties were abrogated, and the safety of persons and of properties rested on other foundations than those which were known to and depended on by those of an earlier period.

The American Revolution had finished its work and was ended: the long-established Government of Law had been crowded aside and, in fact if not entirely in form, had given place to a new Government of arbitrary, unbridled Force: thenceforth, the peace of the County and the rights of Individuals and of Property, within the County, sacredly respected even under a Monarchy, were held only by those who possessed them, subject to the unrestrained will of the stronger.

The careful reader will not have failed to see, in what has been written in this narrative and in the testimony which has been adduced to sustain it, the stern fact that, as far as the Colony of New York was concerned, and we write of no other Colony, the opposition to the measures of the Home Goverment, from 1763 until the Spring of 1775, which, subsequently, became more widely known as THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION, was not, in the slightest degree, the outcome of a popular movement, in which the great body of the Colonists or any considerable portion of it arose in opposition to a wrong, inflicted or sought to be inflicted by the Parliament of Great Britain or by any other body, on the Colony or on any individual member of it, as has been rhetorically pretended, by orators and poets and historians, from that day until the present; but, on the contrary, that it originated in the City of New York, among those of the commercial and mercantile classes, relatively few in number, whom, by reason of their greater wealth or of their higher social standing, we may properly regard, as they were regarded by themselves, as the aristocracy of the Colony—with few, if any exceptions, they were those wealthy and enterprising Merchants, of various names and families and parties and sects and nationalities, each of whom had sunk, for all the purposes of that particular movement, whatever of individual or family or partisan or sectarian or national animosity, against others, he possessed, combined and acting in a common opposition to all those measures of the Home Government which had tended to break down the unblushing lawlessness of those confederated Merchants, in their entire disregard of the Navigation and Revenue Laws of the

Empire, and to enforce on each of those Merchants, in his individual business, that obedience to the Laws which would be no more than his reasonable duty, while it would also tend to the suppression of that corruption of the local Revenue-officers and of that general practise of Smuggling from which he was so complacently acquiring wealth and influence. Except wherein these aristocratic Smugglers employed their ships' crews and the *habitués* of the docks and slums of the City, for purposes of intimidation and political effect, the unfranchised masses of the Colonists in the country as well as in the City, with very rare exceptions, and the Freeholders of small estates and those Freeholders, of either large or small degree, who possessed no pecuniary interest in the foreign commerce of the Port, whether inhabitants of the City or of the rural Counties, had no part nor lot in the inception or in the organization or in the promotion of that opposition to the Home Government which, subsequently, in its more advanced stages, became known, at home and abroad, as THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION.

In fact, while the aristocracy of the Colony was thus confederating and consolidating discordant elements and plotting and breeding disaffection to the Mother Country, the unfranchised Mechanics and Working-men, residents of the City and toilers for their daily bread, with occasional exceptions, pursued their respective industrial vocations, peacefully and industriously, without taking any greater interest in the anxieties of their aristocratic neighbors than those "well-born" "Gentlemen in Trade" were taking in their welfare or in that of their respective families; while the great body of those who occupied the rural Counties of the Colony, also hard-working and peacefully inclined, knew little of and cared less for what was then disturbing the previously well-sustained quiet of the metropolitan counting-rooms.

It is, indeed, true, in this connection, that the aristocratic Merchants and Ship-owners, in the City of New York, had been, during many years, more or less reasonably aggrieved by reason of the governmental interference with their well-established and very profitable "illicit trade," to which reference has been made: it is also true that, for the purpose of influencing and, if possible, of intimidating the Home Government, in their opposition to that Home Government, because of those assumed grievances, those high-toned lawbreakers had repeatedly resorted to the desperate means of, first, appealing to the maxims and the teachings of the fundamental law; of employing the former for their partisan slogan, and the latter for the foundations of their passionate appeals; and, sometimes, second, of employing, directly or indirectly, the floating and the less respectable portions of the population of the City, as supernumeraries on the stage on which they were acting their several parts in the drama of their seeming patriotism—means which were as unreal, in their hands, as their own "patrotism," so called, was deceptive; and, particularly, in the last-mentioned of the two means employed, as hazardous as it was fraudulent—but it is also true that, while the maxims and the teachings of the fundamental law which they so freely bandied, were only words of convenience, meaning nothing beyond the end for securing which they had been thus employed, their auxiliaries, thus enlisted from among the unfranchised and lowly, if not from among the vicious, were, by those who employed them, only regarded as temporary employees, engaged for the performance of particular services, of more or less danger and lawlessness; and not as common heirs to a common inheritance for which both they and those who had thus employed them, as parties possessing an equal interest therein—as the maxims and the teachings of the fundamental law, with which both the employers and the employees, in this instance, were familiar, had clearly indicated to both—were jointly contending.

The American Revolution, as we said in the beginning, originated, not in a popular movement of the great body of the Colonists, nor in any considerable number of those Colonists, in opposition to a wrong, inflicted or sought to be inflicted by the Parliament of Great Britain or by any other body, on the Colony or on any individual member of it, but the commercial and mercantile classes, in the City of New York, the aristocracy of the Colony, in their desperate efforts to shelter "the illicit Trade"—the Smuggling—in which they had been so long and so profitably employed, from the obstructions, more than ordinarily effective, which the Home Government had raised against it, subsequent to the establishment of the Peace, in 1763. As we have said, also, the elaborate essays on the "Rights of Man and of Englishmen," on the "consent" which was necessary in order to give validity to Laws, and, generally, on the assumed grievances to which the Colonists had been subjected, all of them the productions of well-paid Counsel or other interested writers, with which the newspapers of that period were filled to overflowing, were nothing else than means employed for the protection of that prolific, but corrupt, source of the wealth of the Merchants of the City of New York; and the yells and the outrages, inflicted on both persons and properties, of those who had been employed to give effect to those labored arguments of the press, by what were assumed to have been spontaneous outbursts of popular resentment against the usurpations of the Home Government—usurpations of individual rights, by the way, which were only the same as those which were subsequently inflicted, in every State, on those who were not Freeholders; and which the Constitution for the United States has always inflicted and continues to inflict on the inhabitants of the several Territories, who have always been and who are, now, taxed without having consented to any such taxation, their Delegates in the federal Congress having had no right, at any time, to vote on any question whatever

—were no more than additional instrumentalities in the hands of wealthy and unprincipled lawbreakers, Smugglers, employed for the purpose of sheltering those aristocratic culprits from the penalties which the Revenue-laws had imposed on them and, if possible, of enabling them to continue, with impunity, those flagrant violations of morality and of Law which men of less wealth and influence could not have committed without having been exposed to fine and imprisonment and confiscation of property. This, and nothing else, in fact, constituted the beginning of what has been, more recently, unduly elevated to the dignity of a popular patriotic uprising, in support of violated Rights and for the preservation of the Colonies from governmental devastation and ruin; and this, in its various phases, was all there was of that notable Revolution, until the "fire-eaters" of Massachusetts and Virginia, members of the Continental Congress of 1774, seized the control of that body, which had been convened for nothing else than for the promotion of reconciliation and harmony and peace, and transformed it into an instrumentality of lawless violence, of internal strife, and of a disastrous Rebellion.

The careful reader will not have failed to see, also, in what has been written in this narrative and in the testimony which has been adduced to sustain it, that, while honesty and integrity and humanity and patriotism formed no portion of the motives which led the aristocratic Smugglers, in the City of New York, to inaugurate and to sustain a general disaffection against the Home Government; and while their aims, in thus creating and fostering a general discontent among the Colonists, were purely temporary and selfish, intended for nothing else than to perpetuate their own immediate opportunities to make gain at the expense of the Laws and the morals of the Colony, the methods which those influential "Gen-"tlemen in Trade" employed for the promotion of those individual and unholy purposes, were better calculated for the production of permanent than for that of temporary results, since they were employed among those, no matter how homely they were, whose recognized leaders were already well-schooled in the theories of political science, which had been employed for the texts of every political essay and of every partisan harangue, for years past, and who, besides having been politically ambitious, were, also, very shrewd and very energetic men; and, as wealth and a long and successful career in crime are frequently productive of that arrogance and of that recklessness in the selection and employment of means, either for the perpetuation of the opportunities for wrong-doing or for the protection of the offender from the penalties of an outraged Law, which tend, more surely, to the production of disaster than to that of success, so the wealthy and aristocratic culprits, in the City of New York, to whom we have referred, in the instance now under consideration, through the means which they had employed for the intimidation of the Home Government and by their own persistent selfishness, gradually produced a new and powerful political element, adverse to their own pretensions to exclusiveness, to which they had been, previously, strangers. Their want of abilities, as navigators on the troubled waters of Colonial politics, was painfully evident to all others than to themselves; and the adverse power of the new-formed political element was haughtily disregarded, until it had become so well established that it was enabled not only to assert but to maintain its standing.

The character and influence of that new factor in Colonial politics, during the revolutionary era, require a few words concerning its origin, beyond what we have already said of it.

The outlay of wealth can generally secure ingenious advocates for any cause, no matter how unsavory it may be; and, in that of the confederated aristocratic Smugglers of the City of New York, of which mention has been made, well-paid Counsel and ready writers for the newspapers, in their eagerness to support their wealthy and liberal connections and clients, in their systematic violation of the written Law of the land and in their determined struggle to retain the "illicit trade" in which they were so profitably engaged, in the absence of better authorities for the support of their impassioned rhetoric, were obliged to resort to the fundamental and ill-defined theories of political science, with which, through long-continued iteration, the entire body of the inhabitants, the unfranchised as well as the franchised, had already become well acquainted; and, in their purposes to oppose the Home Government and to shelter their opulent employers, those who were thus employed, speakers and writers, loudly spoke and glibly wrote of "the natural Rights of Man" and of "the Rights "of Englishmen," of "*Magna Charta*," and of "repre-"sentation," and of "consent," without the slightest qualification, as if every man and every Colonist were intended to be included in those general and unqualified terms; as if every man throughout the Colony were intended to be considered the equal of every other man, therein and elsewhere; as if every Colonist of every sect and party and in every condition of life were entitled, of right, to be recognized and received and entertained, as an equal, socially and politically and in every other relation, by every other Colonist, of high or of low degree—and, without any qualification, those popular catchwords with which the City had echoed, year after year, meant all these, if they meant anything—all of which, however, in the spirit in which they had been uttered, were audacious fictions, spoken or written in the interest of those who had resorted to them, only for deceitful and illegal and immoral purposes, as would have been quickly seen had "the poor reptiles" who had constituted that lowly mass of unfranchised Working-men, directly and unreservedly, at any time, during

that long period, presumed to have asserted, for themselves, their own manhood, and to have claimed, for themselves, those Rights which had been speciously conceded as having properly belonged to them as much as to any others. In the progress of events, however, either on their own motion or on that of their ambitious leaders—the latter, generally of those who, before the confederation of all parties in an opposition to the Colonial policy of the Home Government, had been of the minority, among the Colonial politicians—these Working-men had commenced to measure their own lowliness and their own political insignificance with the standards which had been placed in their hands, by their aristocratic neighbors, for other purposes; to assert their own political manhood; and to demand a hearing in even the local politics of the day; and in the efforts which were made by the confederated aristocracy of the City, to relegate that new-born and growing power—the growing power of the great body of the Mechanics and Working-men, throughout the Colony—back to its normal obscurity and political insignificance, may be seen the beginning of that ceaseless conflict between the aristocratic and the democratic elements of this mighty Commonwealth, which, having been continued from father to son, is not yet ended.

As we have already intimated, the confederated aristocracy of New York witnessed the appearance of that new element in the politics of the Colony, with anxiety and alarm; and it evidently noticed, also, the constituent parts of it, and duly measured its probable strength, and judiciously determined that, in opposing it, "art" would be better suited to ensure success; than anything of a seemingly unfriendly character would be—in other words, that what appeared to be concessions to the working-classes should be made, but with sufficient of modifications, in reserve, to neutralize the effect of those seeming concessions; and to continue, without abatement, the control of the confederated party of the Opposition to the Home Government, in the Colony, in those aristocratic hands which already possessed it. Indeed, the high-toned "Gentlemen in Trade," guided by their acute legal and political advisers, John Jay and James Duane, determined to continue the same system of contemptuous deceit and treachery which had characterized all their previous political intercourse with the Working-men of the Colony; and, in doing so, they very clearly indicated, a second time, how ill-qualified they were to navigate the troubled waters of Colonial politics.

The first formal organization of those who were in confederated opposition to the Home Government of that period, which was made within the City of New York and, probably, within the Colony—the Caucus of the confederated Merchants, at Sam. Francis's, in May, 1774, which had been evidently assembled under the inspiration of James Duane and John Jay, who were not Merchants, but Lawyers—was really intended quite as much for the adoption of measures which should practically rebuke the evidently growing sense of their own political power which has been recently seen arising among the Working-men and the lowly, throughout the City, if for nothing else, as for the adoption of measures in further opposition to the Home Government, to which it was nominally devoted; and, by adroitness in their management of the movement—the master-spirits of that aristocratic assemblage were not novices in political chicanery—while they really secured, more firmly than ever, the controlling authority in the confederated Opposition to the Home Government, in the aristocracy of the Colony, those master-spirits not only laid the foundations of their own and their family's further advancement, but they, also, so far placated the disaffected Working-men, by making the greater number of their leaders a helpless and powerless minority in the proposed Committee of Fifty-one, that peace and harmony of action, thoroughout the entire Opposition, were immediately restored—they had again deceived the masses of the people; and, once more, a share of that confidence which those lowly masses had reposed in their aristocratic neighbors, was entirely forfeited. Although that new-born element was represented in that Committee of Fifty-one, its representatives were in a powerless minority; and whatever was done in that body, whether the representatives of the Working-men assented or dissented, was, therefore, in fact, nothing else than the act of the confederated aristocracy. It was not long, however, before that fraudulent treatment of the Working-men produced "the "great Meeting in the Fields," and the dissolution of that incongruous alliance, and the resumption of the antagonism of the masses; and it was not long, also, before the confederation of the aristocracy itself, within as well as without the Committee of Fifty-one, was broken by the defection of those who had been the master-spirits of the organization, who, for the advancement of their own and their family's aspirations for place and emolument, had become as unfaithful to their aristocratic associates in the Committee and to the political principles which that Committee had so resolutely maintained, as they and those whom they had controlled and guided, in the Committee, a few weeks previously, had been, to the great body of the Inhabitants of the City, by whom that Committee had been really created and vested with authority to represent the entire body of the Opposition, within the City of New York. There was no abatement of the previously united opposition to the demands of the Working-men, however; and in each of the new-formed factions of the confederated aristocratic Opposition to the Home Government and in all which they or either of them did, there was the same entire disregard of the political rights of the Working-men, then without leaders, which had been so clearly conspicuous in all the actions of the aristoc-

racy, from the beginning of the political troubles, within the Colony.

The reader has been made acquainted with the successful opposition which the Committee of Fifty-one had made to the plan of operations which the Boston-men had proposed and insisted on; and with the successful establishment, instead, of its own project to call a Congress of the several Colonies, for consultation and for the promotion of harmony, in the party of the Opposition, throughout the Continent. He will remember, also, the narrative of the refusal of the Committee of Fifty-one to permit the Mechanics and Working-men to be represented on the ticket for Delegates to the Congress of the Colonies which it had proposed, and that of the consequent failure to elect its proposed Delegation, when its ticket was submitted to the body of the Freeholders and Freemen of the City, at the Polls. He will remember, also, what has been said of the various movements and counter-movements of the rival factions, after the defeat of the Committee's candidates; of the treachery to the Committee who had nominated them and to their aristocratic associates, of four of the five candidates of the Committee; of the consequent election of those five candidates, in the absence of any other candidates, by the united support, at the Polls, of portions of both the aristocratic and democratic elements; of the assembling of the proposed Continental Congress, in which there was not a single representative who was in sympathy with or who honestly represented the working masses of the Colonists; of the seizure of the control of that Congress by the "fire-"eaters" of Massachusetts and Virginia and South Carolina, and the consequent transformation of it, from the instrument for the promotion of reconciliation and peace, for which it had been specifically created and put in motion, into one for the promotion of rebellion and bloodshed, which was utterly obnoxious to all, except a very few, of the Colonists throughout the Continent; of the entire neglect, by that Congress, to seek that redress of the grievances of the Colonists from those by whom, only, such a redress could have been made, notwithstanding it was for that particular purpose the Congress had been convened, and notwithstanding such a reconciliation was what was most earnestly desired "by all good men;" and of the readiness of that Congress to inaugurate a system of violence, in each of the Colonies, for which it afforded ample warrants. He will remember, also, what has been stated concerning the General Assembly of the Colony; its organization; its bold and determined opposition to the obnoxious Colonial policy of the Home Government; its sturdy refusal to become auxiliary to or identified with the Continental Congress, notwithstanding it was not less determined in its opposition to the Ministry; its measures for securing from the Parliament of Great Britain, the only body from whom it could be obtained, a complete redress of what the Colonists regarded as grievances; and the unsuccessful result of its efforts, in that commendable undertaking, only by reason of the boldness of its declarations and of the audacity of its pretensions to rank, as the legally constituted representatives of a free people, notwithstanding they were Colonists.

It will be remembered by all who are familiar with the history of Colonial New York, however, that, although the aristocracy of that old and respectable Colony had always been consistent and united, in its undeviating disregard of the real political rights of the working masses, those in the rural districts as well as those in the Cities, there had been, during many years before the period of which we write [*May*, 1775], and there was, then, a bitter feud, existing within itself, between two rival families and their respective associated families and their several adherents. It will, also, be remembered that, during a long period of years, one of those powerful families and its friends had occupied all or nearly all the high places in the Colonial Government, and had dispensed the extensive patronage of that Government and disposed of its valuable emoluments among those who were known to have been the friends and adherents of the family, agreeably to the dictates of its own controlling will; while the other of those two antagonistic families and those who had been its friends and adherents, during the same long period, had uneasily and unsatisfactorily reposed on nothing else than on their own rural respectability, without any place in the Government of the Colony, without any of that influence which place had afforded so bounteously to its more powerful rival, and without any of those emoluments of office which, more than almost all else, would have been so exceedingly acceptable to every Scotchman and to every other within whose veins the controlling blood was Scotch. The feud between the De Lanceys and the Livingstons, in Colonial New York, is matter of history which is familiarly known to every New-Yorker who is reasonably acquainted with the history of his own country.

When the Home Government, eager to reduce the heavy land-tax to which the country gentlemen of England had been subjected by reason of the demands of that Government, in its vigorous prosecution of the War with France and Spain, first tightened the lines of those who administered the Customs, in the Colonies, and thereby seriously interfered with the smuggling in which every class of the local aristocracy was so largely and so profitably engaged, there was a common reason, which appealed to those of the De Lanceys and those of the Livingstons with equal force, for an opposition to the Home Government, in which those of both the families could harmoniously unite and from which both could be more surely benefitted; and, in accordance with that teaching of common sense, that opposition to the Home Government, of which the reader has been told, was really established in the City of New York, with its organized Committee of

Fifty-one and its more noted Continental Congress among the results of that union.

At the time of which we write, the threatened danger from the working classes appeared to have been averted; the Committee of Fifty-one, or those who had remained in it after the treachery of those who had used it for a stepping-stone to something of greater influence, had slowly retired from the field of political action and had been dissolved by its own action; the Continental Congress and its policy and its methods had been accepted by the Livingstons and their friends and adherents as that which seemed to be best adapted to add strength to their hereditary antagonism to the De Lanceys and their friends and adherents; the General Assembly of the Colony and its policy and its methods, not less in opposition to the Colonial policy of the Home Government than the others, had been accepted by the De Lanceys and their friends and adherents, as well as by the great body of the Colonists, throughout the entire Colony, as the only legitimate exponent of the will of the Colony and the only one which could reasonably be expected to obtain a hearing before the Home Government and the Parliament and the people of Great Britain, from whom, only, a redress of the grievances of the Colony could be obtained; and the Colony was again made the witness and the victim of a bitter feud between rival families, one of them holding and the other endeavoring to obtain all the places and influence and emoluments of the Colonial Government. A Delegation of twelve had been elected, by a Convention which had been convened for that purpose, to represent the Colony in a second Congress of the Colonies; and of that Delegation, two were Livingstons, two were of those who had married Livingstons, and two others were assured and well-tried supporters of the Livingston interest. The excitement which was occasioned by "the news from Lexington" had added strength to the friends of the Continental Congress and its revolutionary policy, to the Livingston interests, and to the revolutionary faction, generally; and, in the same interests and with the same revolutionary ends in view, a Provincial Congress had been called and elected, although, as was subsequently seen, the Deputies thus elected were not always pliant tools, to be handled by a skilful politician, for purely partisan purposes. The control of the political affairs of the Colony, it will be seen, as far as those affairs could be controlled by the revolutionary faction, was, by the election of the members of the Provincial Congress, firmly secured to the Livingstons and to their friends; and the government of the Colonists, thenceforth, was revolutionary, without warrant of Law, and oligarchic.

In England, at the time of which we write, the Ministry, revelling in the strength of its party and haughtily disregarding everything of prudence and conciliation, had recently led the Parliament to enact, first, the Bill for restraining the Trade and Commerce of the Provinces of Massachusetts-Bay and New Hampshire and the Colonies of Connecticut and Rhode Island and Providence Plantations, in North America, with Great Britain, Ireland, and the British Islands in the West Indies; and to prohibit such Provinces and Colonies from carrying on any Fishery on the Banks of Newfoundland or other places therein mentioned, under certain specified conditions and limitations; and, second, the Bill for restraining the Trade and Commerce of the Colonies of New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Maryland, Virginia, and South Carolina, with Great Britain, Ireland, and the British Islands in the West Indies, under certain conditions and limitations—the Commerce and Fishing Rights of the Colony of New York, in each instance, having been left, undisturbed—and the First Session of the Fourteenth Parliament was drawing near to its close. The disturbance of Trade which was consequent on the political differences, had already produced great distress, in Great Britain, among those whose lives and labors and properties were employed in the manufacture of goods specifically intended for the American market; and, at the same time, the Merchants, in that country, and those who had given credits, commercial or financial, to the Colonists, in America, were anxiously considering in what way, if at all, since entire commercial non-intercourse, except that which was surreptitious and corrupt,[1] had been ordered by the Parliament as well as by the Continental Congress, they were to receive payment of what was due or becoming due to them—anxieties which were not removed by the aristocratic and "patriotic" "debtors," in some of the Colonies, at least, whence remittances had been entirely suspended and where the Courts of Justice were not permitted to assist in the collection of debts.

In New York, at the time of which we write, as far as the great body of the Colonists in the rural Counties were concerned, there does not appear to have been any noticeable change—the farmers had not been disturbed in their labors, during 1774; and the surplus of their productions, which had found early markets, had undoubtedly been disposed of at those better than ordinary prices which are known to have prevailed, in consequence of the increased demand which had been produced, early in the Autumn, by the approaching embargo. In the City, the suspen-

[1] The full supplies of goods, of every description, which were shipped to Boston, with the knowledge of officers who occupied high places in the Government, on Transport Ships and disguised as Stores for the Royal Army—sometimes paid for, as Stores for the Army, by the King's Treasurer—subsequently became a subject of searching investigation before the House of Commons. The Schedules of Goods thus shipped afford amusing evidence of what were officially considered as Army Stores: they clearly show, also, the relative weight of morality and immorality, whenever the profits of trade are considered, and how vastly more the Profit and Loss Accounts, on their respective Ledgers, will influence the morals and the religion and the doings of "Men in Business," Merchants and others, than anything which their Mothers have taught them, anything which their Bibles have presented to their consideration, or anything which their consciences have brought before them

sion of the foreign trade, by the experimental action of the first Continental Congress, must have been as disastrous to the great body of the inhabitants—those possessing small Estates as well as the Tradesmen and Mechanics and Workingmen, of every lowly class—as that much written-of Port Bill, imposed by the retributive action of the King and the Parliament of Great Britain, had produced on the similar classes who had inhabited the Town of Boston, in the preceding year; but the men of New York and their dependent families had endured whatever of hardships there had been in the suspension of their respective means of support, without those outcries, nominally of assumed distress among "the suffering inhabitants"—more loudly uttered by demagogues, for other purposes, than by those who were really sufferers, praying for relief—which had distinguished Boston, a few months previously, and which had induced the tender-hearted, the world over, to become politicians and to reprobate the Home Government by whom the Port Bill had been imposed; to sympathize with those who were said to have been "suffering," although the latter could have found remunerative labor elsewhere than in Boston; and to contribute the means which were really expended, very largely, more for the benefit of the taxpayers than for that of the "suffering poor" of the Town. The suspension of their business, by the aristocracy of America, who could sustain the present strain in order to ensure the receipt of an ultimate advantage, was, we say, no less severe in New York than the similar suspension of her business, by the aristocracy of Great Britain, had been in Boston; and the sufferngs of of the working classes were, undoubtedly, quite as keenly felt in the one case as in the other; but, in the instance of New York, there was neither an appeal for help nor an ostentatious display of "patriotic" sympathy, extending help; and if the sufferings of the lowly victims, in New York, were noticed at all, by those "patriotic" aristocrats who had produced those distresses, it was only in those congratulatory remarks, not unfrequently seen in the published correspondence of the not distant later period, that the necessities of the working-classes were compelling them to enlist in the Armies, in order to obtain even a portion of the food which was needed to keep their dependent wives and little ones from starvation, and that "for the "Rights of man and of Englishmen."

The "determination" of the Continental Congress of 1774, to appoint Committees "in every County, "City, and Town," "whose business it should be attentively to observe the conduct of all persons, "touching the *Association*," which that Congress also enacted, and with extraordinary powers for persecuting and bringing ruin on whomsoever those local Committees should determine to put under a ban, had not yet become as well-seated, in the Colony of New York, as in some of the other Colonies;[1] but the City of New York was thus controlled; and, possibly, some of the rural communities who were more than ordinarily revolutionary in their inclinations, may, also, have already appointed such Committees. In Westchester-county, however, although the handful of office-seekers who hovered around the Morrises, and who did what those haughty leaders told them to do in return for official favors received or looked for, had recently appointed such a County Committee, at the time of which we write, it had not yet commenced its subsequently well-known work of inquisitorial proscription and plunder and outrage. There were individuals, among the farmers or in the little villages or at the several landings, who remembered and continued to condemn the usurpations of political authority which had signalized the first Continental Congress and had divided and lessened the power of the Opposition; and these and others who had attended the recently-held meeting at the White Plains may have been and undoubtedly were discontented and outspoken, within their respective families and among their neighbors, producing, in some instances, undoubtedly, ill-feelings and personal animosities and less harmonious neighborhoods. But, notwithstanding all these, the great body of the inhabitants of the County was entirely undisturbed; the labors of the day had been done, as they had previously been done, on the hundreds of homesteads, throughout the County; political questions in which they felt no interest had not slackened the domestic or the out-door industries nor lessened the holiday or evening pleasures of by far the greater number; and, with here and there a clearly perceptible change, the staid old agricultural County was undisturbed, in all its various relations. The Colonial officers continued to discharge their various duties, as their predecessors had done—John Thomas, who had occupied the Bench of the Court of Common Pleas, since May, 1755, continued to discharge the duties of that office, as well as those of the other office of Representative of the County, in the General Assembly, without

[1] The following description of the methods adopted by those local Committees, and the extent to which they carried their new-found authority, although it relates peculiarly to Virginia, is entirely applicable to the methods and the extent of authority of similar Committees, in every other Colony: "The *Associations* first, in part, entered into, recommended by the people of this Colony, and adopted by what is called "'the Continental Congress,' are now entering, throughout this country, with the greatest rigour. A Committee has been chosen in every "County, whose business it is to carry the *Association* of the Congress "into execution: which Committee assumes an authority to inspect the "books, invoices, and all other secrets of the trade and correspondence "of Merchants; to watch the conduct of every Inhabitant, without distinction; and to send for all such as come under their suspicion, into "their presence, to interrogate them respecting all matters which, at "their pleasure, they think fit objects of their inquiry, and to 'stigmatize,' as they term it, such as they find transgressing what they "are now hardly enough to call 'the Laws of the Congress,' which 'stigmatizing' is no other than inviting the vengeance of an outrageous "and lawless mob, to be exercised upon the unhappy victims."—(*The Earl of Dunmore to the Earl of Dartmouth*, "WILLIAMSBURG," [*Virginia*,] "December 21, 1774," laid before the House of Commons, February 13, 1775.—Almon's *Parliamentary Register*, House of Commons, First Session, Fourteenth Parliament, i., 185, 186.)

being disturbed, by any one; and James De Lancey, who had been the Sheriff of the County, since June, 1770, and David Dayton, who had been the Surrogate, since June, 1766, and John Bartow, who had been the Clerk of the County, since April, 1760, each in his appointed official place, continued to discharge the official duties which were incumbent on them, and to receive and to enjoy the emoluments which those several offices secured to them—the Courts of the County continued their several Sessions, at the appointed times; and, as we have said, with occasional individual or neighborhood exceptions, a general quiet prevailed, a quiet which preceded a terrible convulsion, as the reader will shortly see.

The machinery of government which had been created by the revolutionary elements, within and without the Colony of New York, was, very soon, put in motion. It was composed of only a series of conclaves, each of which exercised, arbitrarily, Legislative, Executive, and Judicial functions, unrestrained by either constitutional or statutory provisions, and controlled, in whatever it determined to do or not to do, only by the individual impulses of such, within this Colony, as the Livingstons and the Morrises, the Van Cortlandts and the Thomases, and as James Duane and John Jay, men, in every instance, who were distinguished for their entire disregard of and contempt for the unfranchised and lowly masses, of every class, as well as of those who were franchished, but not "well-born"—the former being looked on, by them, as fit only for labor and for fighting; and the latter as no better than the others, unless on election-days—and who represented only the uncontrolled and purely aristocratic prejudices and antipathies and the equally uncontrolled and malignant partisan animosities and jealousies of those who, during many years, had been excluded from official life, and who, by the whirligig of rebellion, were, then, first enjoying, in an extremely diluted form, what they had so long and so anxiously hankered for.[1]

The Congress of the Continent assembled at Philadelphia, agreeably to order, on Wednesday, the tenth of May, 1775; and, ten Colonies being represented—only three of the Delegates from New York having been present, that Colony was not counted—it was formally organized by the election of Peyton Randolph, of Virginia, as its President, and Charles Thomson, of Pennsylvania, as its Secretary.[2] The history of its doings, generally, is known to every intelligent person, and need not be repeated, unless in such instances as particularly related to Westchester-county or to those who were within the bounds of that County, during the period of the War of the Revolution.

On Monday, the twenty-second of May, 1775, a number of those who had been designated as Deputies from the several Counties of the Colony, assembled at the Exchange, in the City of New York, for the purpose of forming a Provincial Congress; but, because they conceived there was not a sufficient number of Deputies present, they adjourned until the following day, without having attempted to organize. On the latter day, [*Tuesday, May* 23, 1775,] those Deputies who were then present assembled at the Exchange, "the Deputies of a majority of the Counties" having appeared; and a "Provincial Congress for the "Colony of New-York" was organized by the election of Peter Van Brugh Livingston—one of the most violent of the former "Committee of Correspondence," a brother of the Lord of the Manor of Livingston, and a brother-in-law and partner in business of that Earl of Stirling, so called, who figured so largely in the military history of the War of the Revolution—to be its President; and John McKesson and Robert Benson, the latter a brother of that Egbert Benson whose extraordinary election as a Deputy from Duchess-county to the earlier Provincial Convention, has been already noticed, were elected to be its Secretaries.[3] Although the doings of that body are less generally known than those of the Continental Congress, the purposes of this work will not require any further reference to them, than to such portions as relate particularly, to Westchester-county or to those who were within that County, and to such other portions thereof as, in their effects, affected that County or its inhabitants, during the period of the War of the Revolution.

As has been already stated, the local Committee for Westchester-county was created on the eighth of May, 1775, ninety members having been miraculously created out of the material of which twenty-three were actually composed; and Gilbert Drake was made its Chairman.[4] Micah Townsend, subsequently holding other offices of honor, in both Westchester and Cumberland-counties, was made the Secretary of that Committee;[5] and its doings, as far as they were

[1] It was well said by Henry C. Van Schaack, in his *Life* of his father, "It will scarcely now be credited that powers so undefined and extraordinary should have been intrusted to a few individuals, by a people so "jealous of encroachments; whose sense of liberty was so keen as to "'sniff the approach of tyranny in every tainted breeze;' and who, "on their own part, had gone to war against a preamble."—Van Schaack's *Life of Peter Van Schaack*, 67.

The barbarities which were officially inflicted on individuals and families, in many instances only for an *opinion* extorted by their persecutors, without an overt act or the inclination to commit one, as those barbarities have been officially recorded, were perfectly shocking; and some of those which were inflicted on residents of Westchester-county, under the guidance of such notable Westchester county men as John Jay and Gouverneur Morris, will find places in other parts of this narrative.

[2] *Journal of the Congress*, "PHILADELPHIA, Wednesday, May 10, 1775."

[3] *Journal of the Provincial Congress*, "CITY OF NEW-YORK, May 22nd, "1775," and addition, including the proceedings on the following day.

[4] *Credentials of Delegates to Provincial Congress*, May 8, 1775.—*Historical Manuscripts relative to the War of the Revolution: Credentials of Delegates*, xxiv., 153; *Rivington's New-York Gazetteer*, No. 108, NEW-YORK, Thursday, May 11, 1775.

The *Credentials* mentioned above were signed "GILBERT DRAKE, "*Chairman*;" but those of the Delegates elected to the Second Provincial Congress, signed by the same person, bear the signature of "GILBERT "H. DRAKE, *Chairman*."—(*Historical Manuscripts*, etc.: *Credentials of Delegates*, xxiv., 67.)

[5] *Historical Manuscripts*, etc.: *Credentials of Delegates*, xxiv., 67.

recorded in the annals of the County, will be duly noticed, as the narrative progresses.

The organization of the Provincial Congress, on the twenty-third of May, 1775, has been already mentioned and described:[1] a more particular description of the membership of that body which, in the interest of those who were in rebellion, was to take places beside the several departments of the legally constituted Colonial Government, in the government of the Colony, and which was to wield so important an influence over all who were within the Colony, seems to be incumbent on us, in this place.

Of the fourteen Counties of which the Colony of New York was then composed, thirteen were properly designated "the Counties," or "the country Counties," since they were mainly occupied by communities of farmers, unless in the instances of the frontier Counties, in which hunters and trappers and surveying parties and, not unfrequently, families and villages of the aborigines, afforded considerable portions of their continually changing populations. Of these thirteen rural Counties, some of the inhabitants of Albany and Duchess and Westchester and Queens made pretensions to something of social superiority, somewhat akin to the aristocracy of the City of New York; but, in none of them, unless in Albany-county, was there any pretension to a controlling local aristocracy; and in all of them, the actual tillers of the soil largely outnumbered all other classes, on the Census-lists. From such widely dissimilar constituencies, in town and country, therefore, even from those who were not widely separated and differently situated, there could not be expected Delegations to the Provincial Congress who were homogeneous in their characters and dispositions and inclinations; and as all those rural Delegations possessed more or less of the elements which prevailed among those who were nominally their respective constituencies, it was to be a work of time and patience and skill, in partisan and factional discipline, to bring all of them into "working order," in the interest of the controlling, or revolutionary, faction of the aristocracy—a work of which notice will be taken, hereafter.

The City and County of New York, of course, was represented in the Provincial Congress by the extremes of both conservatism and of radicalism, with a generous sprinkling of those who favored that political association which promised the greater pecuniary profits; and the several Delegations from Albany and Queens and Westchester and Duchess-counties, respectively contained, also, more or less of mixed memberships. From the remaining nine Counties, the Delegations were generally smaller in number; and, very largely, especially in the earlier days of the existence of the Congress, they were composed of those who had honestly come for the purpose of protecting the Colony from the wrongs to which the Home Government was said to have subjected it; but, at the same time, their inclinations were peaceful; and they preferred a reconciliation with Great Britain, instead of a Civil War, which had been already commenced; and, because they had not yet been corrupted by the social influences of life in the City nor by the allurements of official plunder, they were ready to join with all or with any, regardless of their factional affiliations, who entertained similar views, in the practical establishment of those fundamental principles. The individual members of the first Provincial Congress of New York, at the opening and during the earlier period of the existence of that body, may, therefore, be classed as, *first*, the avowed Conservatives, who were led by such as John De Lancey and Benjamin Kissam and Abraham Walton and Richard Yates and George Folliot and Walter Franklin; as, *second*, the "Corporal's Guard" of avowed Revolutionists, who were led by John Morin Scott and Alexander McDougal and Abraham Brasier; as, *third*, a larger number, those who, under the guise of patriotism, were aiming at nothing else than at places and at the influences and emoluments to be produced by those places, who were led by the Livingstons and the Van Cortlandts, by Gouverneur Morris and John Thomas and Melanthon Smith and Abraham Ten Broeck and Egbert Dumond and Nathaniel Woodhull and John Sloss Hobart; and as, *last*, outnumbering all others, those who had left their several rural homes and come to the City of New York, for the purpose of serving their country, without having had, at that time, any other aim.

As the several Delegations voted as units, the votes of the several Counties having been cast in accordance with the determination of the majority of the Delegates of each who were then present, the votes of individual Delegates, unless in instances of formal dissent, are not recorded; but the conservatism of the organized Congress, as an aggregate, was seen, immediately after the organization of that body and the adoption of its necessary *Rules of Order*, on the first day of the Session, when Isaac Low, of the City of New York, who is already so well known to the reader, had commenced the work of centralizing all of political authority and power which were within the Colony, except those of the local police, in the Continental Congress, a work which has been persistently continued until this day, by men of the same classes of society and politics, and for the same purposes; and when, very promptly and very aptly, Gouverneur Morris, of the County of Westchester, who was already conspicuously notorious for his contemptuous disregard of the personal and political rights of the unfranchised masses of the Colonists, who were only "poor reptiles" in his aristocratic vocabulary,[2] had seconded the motion. The Resolution which Isaac Low had thus offered, was in these words:

[1] Vide page 91, ante.

[2] See his letter to Mr. Penn, pages 11, 12, ante.

"RESOLVED, As the opinion of this Congress, that implicit obedience ought to be paid to every recommendation of the Continental Congress, for the general regulation of the associated Colonies; but this "Congress is competent to and ought, freely, to deliberate and determine on all matters relative to the "internal police of this Colony."[1]

Such a Resolution, so evidently in the interest of the master-spirits of the revolt and in that of the most ultra of the aristocracy of the Colony, at the same time so radically subversive of those fundamental principles of government which were professed to have been the basis of the existing Rebellion against the Mother Country, very reasonably excited immediate alarm; and, notwithstanding the Delegates were scarcely warm in their seats, the two ill-concealed monarchists who were temporarily masquerading, within the Provincial Congress, as republicans, and those, of the same class, elsewhere, in whose behalf the Resolution had been offered, were very effectually snubbed—on a motion of John Morin Scott, the very able leader of the handful of ultra-revolutionists, seconded by David Clarkson, both of the City of New York, the Resolution was defeated, only Richmond-county having voted in favor of it,[2] neither the mover nor the seconder of it having received the support of the County of which he professed to have been a proper representative.[3]

The signal rebuke which the not yet corrupted "country gentlemen," members of the Provincial Congress of New York, had thus given to those who had proposed to make the Colony of New York and all which it possessed subject, in all its relations, except in the local power of police, to a foreign body over whom neither the individual Colonists nor the aggregated Colony could possibly have exercised the slightest control, and by whom both the individual Colonists and the Colony in its entirety would have been subjected to an absolutely despotic control by those, of other Colonies, who already envied the rising greatness of New York, appears to have been effective, in that direction; but, two days afterwards, the little ultra-revolutionary clique, within the Congress, taking courage from the evidently independent spirit which had been manifested by the rural Delegations, in the former vote, and hoping that the same spirit of antagonism to the monarchical inclinations, which those "country gentlemen" had then presented, would rest, peacefully and usefully, on an inclination in the opposite direction, made a movement, within the Congress, in behalf of Revolution and Rebellion and a Civil War.

As the Colony of New York had not yet given that public testimony of its entire and cordial accession to the confederacy of the revolted Colonies which had been given to it by the other Colonies, in the express approbation, by each, of the proceedings of the Continental Congress of 1774, of which proceedings detailed mention has been made in other portions of this narrative, an attempt was made, in the Provincial Congress, on the twenty-fifth of May, to supply that previously omitted ratification and approval of the proceedings of that already notable Congress, and, by that ratification and approval, to carry the Colony of New York within the circle of the confederacy of the revolt, and to make her subject to influences and obligations from which she had previously been free. For those purposes, and for others which were not less important although they were less visible, John Morin Scott, the leader of the revolutionary clique, moved "in the words following, to wit:

"As this Colony has not as yet given that public "testimony of their entire and cordial accession to "the confederacy of the Colonies on this Continent "which has been given by the other Colonies, in their "express approbation of the proceedings of the last "Continental Congress, I move that it be

"RESOLVED, That this Congress do fully approve "of the proceedings of the said Congress."

This Resolution was promptly seconded by Thomas Smith, a brother of William and of Joshua Hett Smith who subsequently became more widely known than they were, at that time; and it is evident that a defeat of that well-devised plan, also, had not been considered as even probable, by those who had devised it. But, as we are informed, "debates arose on "the said motion"—there were grave questions, at that time, concerning the propriety of such an approval of all the proceedings of that first Congress, as was proposed by the leaders of the ultra-revolutionists—and the rural Delegations again determined on the side of peace and reconciliation and Colonial independence from all foreign influences, by postponing the further consideration of the proposition, without day,[4] where it has remained, from that day until the present.

It is more than possible that the avowed Conservative elements within the Provincial Congress had been largely instrumental in securing both these votes, in opposition to the discordant efforts, successively, of the ultra-aristocracy, represented by Isaac Low and Gouverneur Morris, and of the ultra-revolu-

[1] *Journal of the Provincial Congress*, "5 ho., P.M., May 23d."

[2] The vote of Richmond-county, in this early instance, is very remarkable, especially when it is considered in connection with the later instances of that County's want of sympathy with both the Continental Congress and those who engineered that notable body.

This vote also affords a lesson of the greatest significance, illustrative of the effects of that ill-considered policy of uniformity in political opinions, enforced by a military power, which the Provincial Congress, in its later and more corrupt days, adopted and enforced—by the adoption and enforcement of such an extremely violent policy, instead of one in which conciliation and local peace might have been the more prominent features, the inhabitants of Richmond-county were violently repelled, by the ultra-revolutionists, as others like-situated were similarly repelled, compelling them to seek first, protection, and, next, fellowship, among those with whom they had, previously, had no sympathy.

[3] *Journal of the Provincial Congress*, "5 ho., P.M., May 23d."

[4] *Journal of the Provincial Congress*, "5 ho., P.M., May 25th."

tionary faction, represented by John Morin Scott and Thomas Smith; but, whatever may have led to the practical rejection of those two propositions, each of which tended toward the centralization of the entire authority and all the power of the several Colonies, in the Congress of the Continent, thereby destroying the autonomy of each of the Colonies, without subjecting that Congress, in its exercise of that authority and that power, to any other limitation than the unbridled will of a majority of the Delegations composing it, this is clearly evident: the Provincial Congress intended, by those two adverse votes, to declare that, though a purely local body, it was, nevertheless, determined not to divest itself, even by implication, of that unquestioned governmental supremacy, within the Colony of New York, which it had already acquired, no matter how; that, on the contrary, it had determined to retain, within itself, and to continue to exercise, unhampered by the interference of any other body, the several legislative, and judicial, and executive authorities, within the Colony, which it already held, no matter by what warrant; that it would yield to the Continental Congress, if it yielded anything to that foreign body, nothing else than a voluntary acquiescence; that it would promulgate the Orders and Resolutions and "recommendations" of that other Congress, if it promulgated them at all, not as original and supreme rules of action of all who were or who might be within the Colony of New York, but as the bases of its own local enactments, to the latter of which, *per se*, and not to the former, it required the implicit obedience of all those within or to come within the Colony, whose supreme political ruler it assumed to be and to remain. In short, from the beginning, the Provincial Congress of New York recognized no superior, controlling power, except that of its own actual constituents; and, at no subsequent period—not even when the Governor of New York declined the release of Alexander McLeod, though demanded by both the Government of Great Britain and the President of the United States—has there been any more resolute supporter of the Sovereignty of the several States, any more determined opponent of a transfer to any other body, from the People—which latter word is only an equivalent term for the State, and, in New York, if not elsewhere, is used, officially, to designate the State, itself—of the original authority, the Sovereignty of those several Peoples, than was that revolutionary Congress of the Colony of New York, in its opposition, on the one hand, to its ultra-aristocratic master-spirits, and, on the other, to the ultra-revolutionists among its members, early in the year 1775.

As a portion of the history of those times, reference may be made, in this place, to an incident which occurred in the Provincial Congress, soon after that body had rejected the Resolution which Isaac Low and Gouverneur Morris had offered, of which mention has been made. On the same day, the first day of the Session of that revolutionary body, during the same afternoon, a motion was made by Alexander McDougal, a Presbyterian, providing for the appointment of a Committee of two, to apply to all the Ministers in the City who could pray in English, "to "make such an arrangement among themselves as "would enable them alternately to open the Congress, "every morning, with prayer;" but Gouverneur Morris, Lewis Graham, Colonel Philip Van Cortlandt, Colonel James Holmes, Stephen Ward, and John Thomas, Junior, six of the nine members of the Congress who were from Westchester-county, probably recognizing the evident impropriety of spreading their politically dirty hands before Him who giveth no favor to those who loveth and maketh a lie, dissented from a majority of the Congress, and caused their dissent to be entered on the *Journal* of that body.[1]

On Friday, the twenty-sixth of May, the Provincial Congress adopted, unanimously, a Resolution, offered by Gilbert Livingston of Duchess-county and seconded by John De Lancey of New York City, providing for the appointment of a Committee of one from each County, "to draw "up and report a proper Resolve of this Con-"gress, recommending to the different Counties "in this Colony, to form themselves into County "Committees, and also into Sub-committees for their "respective Townships and Districts, and recommend-"ing the signing of the *General Association*; and also "to prepare and report to this Congress a draft of a "letter to be sent to the Committees and other per-"sons in the several Counties, for the above purposes, "and with copies of such Resolution." In that Committee of one from each County, Major Philip Van Cortlandt represented Westchester-county;[2] and, on the following day, [*May* 27, 1775] it made a Report, in due form.[3]

The Resolution which was thus reported, was in these words: "RESOLVED: That it be recommended, "and it is hereby accordingly recommended, to all the "Counties in this Colony, (who have not already done "it,) to appoint County Committees, and also Sub-"committees for their respective Townships, Pre-"cincts, and Districts, without delay, in order to carry "into execution the Resolutions of the Continental "and this Provincial Congress.

"And that it is also recommended to every Inhabitant "of this Colony, who has hitherto neglected to sub-"scribe the *General Association*, to do it with all con-"venient speed. And for these purposes that the "Committees in the respective Counties in which "Committees have been formed, do tender the said "*Association* to every Inhabitant within the several "Districts in each County. And that such persons,

[1] *Journal of the Provincial Congress* "5 ho., P.M., May 23d."
[2] *Journal of the Congress*, "4 ho., P.M., May 26th, 1775."
[3] *Journal of the Congress*, "Die Saturnii, 9 ho., A.M., May 27th, 1775."

"in those Counties or Districts who have not appointed Committees, as shall be appointed by the members of this Congress representing such Counties and Districts respectively,[1] do make such tender as aforesaid in such Counties and Districts respectively; and that the said Committees and persons respectively do return the said *Association* and the names of those who shall neglect or refuse to sign the same, to this Congress, by the fifteenth day of July next, or sooner, if possible."

The letter which was reported, as a companion to this Resolution, was in the following words:

"NEW-YORK, May 29, 1775.

"GENTLEMEN:

"You will see by the enclosed Resolution of this Congress, that it is recommended to such of the Counties as have not already formed Committees, to do it without delay, and that such of the Inhabitants of this Colony as have hitherto neglected to subscribe the *General Association*, do it, so as to enable you to make a return within the time limited in the Resolution.

"As the execution of this Resolve is committed to your care, we request you to use your best endeavours to see that this recommendation be complied with. It may, nevertheless, be proper to inform you that it is the sense of this Congress that no coercive steps ought to be used to induce any person to sign the *Association*. The propriety of the measure, the example of the other Counties, and the necessity of maintaining a perfect union in every part of this Colony, it is presumed, are sufficient reasons to induce the Inhabitants of your County to comply with this requisition."

The Resolution and letter which were thus reported to the Provincial Congress, were taken up, for consideration, on the twenty-ninth of May; and, after some amendments had been made therein, they were "approved, agreed to, and resolved;" and five hundred copies were ordered to be printed; and as many copies of the letter as should be necessary were ordered to be signed by the President and delivered to the members of the Congress, "to be by them directed."[2]

As the County of Westchester had already been favored with the appointment of a County-committee, or what purported to have been such a Committee,[3] it is probable that it was not considered necessary, in that instance, to interfere with that former appointment; and there is very little evidence, as far as we have been able to find any, which indicates that the several Towns throughout the County paid any attention to the recommendation of the Congress, for the appointment of Town-committees;[4] and there is no evidence whatever, that any attempt was made, in any of those Towns, to obtain the signatures of the body of the inhabitants of the County, to the *General Association* which had been enacted by the Continental Congress of 1774, nor to any other such *Association*[5]—the Provincial Congress had done no more than, nominally, to "recommend" to the inhabitants to sign the *Association*;[6] it not only did not authorize the employment of force in order to obtain signatures thereto, but it expressly disclaimed, in advance, the entertainment of any such idea;[7] the Congress itself, by a formal vote, had postponed a formal approval of that *General Association* as well as all of the other doings of the Continental Congress, who had enacted it;[8] and, for these reasons, as well as for others with which the reader is already familiar, the conservative yeomanry of Westchester-county was not in a hurry to either recognize or sign it.

The Committee of the Provincial Congress who had been appointed to consider the very important subject of the Currency, for the support of the Rebellion, made a very clear and able Report, on the thirtieth of May, in which some of the commercial troubles produced or likely to be produced by the Rebellion were very graphically presented; and an issue

[1] The authority which appears to have been vested in members of the Provincial Congress, to appoint local Committees where the inhabitants had not done so, probably originated in that Congress, in an earlier secret meeting of that body; but no record of any such action is seen on its published *Journal*—like the *Secret Journals of the Continental Congress*, those of the Provincial Congress of New York, could they also be published, would undoubtedly throw different tints of light and color on many a romance, called "history."

[2] *Journal of the Provincial Congress*, "Die Lunæ 4 ho., P.M., May 29th, 1775."

[3] See pages 82, 83, ante.

[4] There were Committees in a small number of the Towns, at a later period; but there is no evidence, as far as we have knowledge, that they originated in the recommendation of the Provincial Congress, nor as early as in 1775.

[5] The *Association*, duly signed by those who would sign it and duly noting those who declined to do so, was to be returned to the Secretary of the Provincial Congress, on or before the fifteenth of July, 1775. The files of that Congress, which are preserved in the office of the Secretary of State, at Albany, show, however, that the only Counties or Towns which made any Returns of Associators, in response to this Resolution, were Orange, Ulster, Suffolk, Duchess, one District in Charlotte, three Districts in Cumberland, and a few scattering names, not more than fifty, in Queens; but there is no such Return from Westchester-county; there is no such Return among the archives of the County, in the office of the County-clerk; and we have failed to find anything resembling such a Return, in the offices of the Town-clerks, in the several Towns.

The signer of the following, which was sent from Amenia, in Duchess-county, is classed among the "3 Tories" of that "Precinct:"

"June ye 8th, A^d 1775. This may sertyfy all pepel whome it may "cornsern that I the Sybscriber am willing to do what is best and "wright to secure the priviligs of a mariga both sivel and sacred and to "follow the advise of our Reverend congress so far as they do the word "of God and the exzample of Jesys Christ and I hope in the grace of God "no more will be required, as witness my hand,

"JOHN GARNSEY."

[6] See the Resolutions of the Provincial Congress, page 94, ante.

[7] See the general Circular Letter of the Congress, on this page, ante.

The same declaration, more distinctly uttered, may be seen in the *Letter of the Provincial Congress to Christopher Yates and Major Willis Fowler, of Tryon-county*; in *that from the same to Colonel James Rogers, of Kent, in Cumberland-county*; and in *that from the same to Jacob Bailey and Colonel Peters, of Gloucester-county*—all of them dated "IN PROVINCIAL CONGRESS, NEW YORK, the 31st May, 1775."

[8] *Journal of the Provincial Congress*, "5 ho., P.M., May 29th," pages 93, ante.

of that Currency by the Continental Congress, with specified provisions for the payment of it, was recommended[1]—the original proposition for the emission of those immense amounts of "Continental-bills," which, subsequently and with the help of friendly legislation in the Continental Congress, afforded so favorable an opportunity for repudiation by the United States, "the faith of the Nation" to the contrary notwithstanding.

The Report of the Committee was "fully debated "and considered," by the Provincial Congress, and, by an unanimous vote, it was adopted, with an order transmitting a copy of it to the Delegates of the Colony, in the Continental Congress.[2]

A circumstance occurred, within the Provincial Congress, early in its Session, which requires particular notice in this place.

One week after that body had been originally organized, [*May* 30, 1775] Benjamin Kissam, of the City of New York, "moved in the words following, "to wit: 'Forasmuch as a reconciliation between "Great Britain and these Colonies, on constitutional "principles, is essential to the well-being of both "countries, and will prevent the horrors of a Civil "War, in which this Continent is now about to be "involved, it is, therefore, the indispensable duty "of this Congress, to communicate to the Delegates "of this Colony, in Continental Congress, their sen-"timents respecting the terms of such reconciliation; "I, therefore, move that a Committee be appointed "to prepare and state the terms on which such re-"conciliation may be tendered to Great Britain, con-"sistent with the just Liberties and Freedom of the "subject, in America, to the intent that the same, "when approved by this Congress, may be laid before "the said Delegates, as our sense, on this important "subject, to be humbly submitted to their considera-"tion."

A question of such great importance and so distasteful to many of the Deputies, was reasonably discussed with much warmth; and it is very evident that, had the vote been taken, at that time, the motion would have been adopted by the Provincial Congress. It was evidently approved by a majority of the Counties; but, if the vote could be postponed, changes might be effected, by fair means or by foul—there were astute and experienced politicians within and around that Provincial Congress—and three of the Counties who were opposed to the motion resorted to the tenth Rule of the Congress,[3] not resorted to, on any other occasion, during the entire period of the existence of that Congress, to secure that advantage and, thereby, if possible, to defeat the motion—"at the request of the Deputies of the City "and County of Albany and the Counties of "Ulster, Suffolk, and Charlotte," it was "ORDERED, "That the same be deferred."[4]

Although the Rule required the Congress to resume the consideration of the motion on "the next day," the Rule was disregarded;[5] and, on the following day [*June* 1, 1775,] Mr. Kissam, with the leave of the Congress, withdrew the motion, "in order to "amend it."[6]

On the second of June, the amended motion was submitted by Mr. Kissam, "in the words following, "to wit: Forasmuch as a reconciliation between "Great Britain and these Colonies, on constitutional "principles, is essential to the well-being of both "countries, and will prevent the horrors of a Civil "War, in which this Continent is now about to be "involved: I move that a Committee be appointed "to prepare a plan of such accommodation, and re-"port the same to this House."

The revolutionary faction, led by John Morin Scott and Alexander McDougal, resolutely opposed the motion; and the last-named, seconded by Abraham Brasher, moved for the previous question, in order to defeat it; but only Ulster, Orange, Suffolk, and Duchess-counties favored the motion for the previous question; and it was defeated—Philip Van Cortlandt, differing from all his associates from Westchester-county, voting with the revolutionary faction. The motion of Mr. Kissam was then carried, without any dissent, except that of Philip Van Cortlandt, who recorded that dissent on the *Journal of the Congress*.

Colonel Woodhull, of Suffolk, one of those who had opposed the motion, then moved, as an amendment of the motion, the addition of these words: "That we may be ready, if we shall think it neces-"sary, to communicate our sentiments upon that sub-"ject to our Delegates at Philadelphia;" which was subsequently adopted, without a division, in the following words: "RESOLVED, therefore, That, although "we would, by no means, presume to dictate to the "General Continental Congress, yet it is highly nec-"essary that this House be prepared to give our sen-"timents to our Delegates, in the said Congress, upon "such plan of accommodation." With the appointment of John Morin Scott, Isaac Low, Alexander McDougal, Benjamin Kissam, and Thomas Smith, of the City of New York; John Sloss Hobart, Colonel Nathaniel Woodhull, and Thomas Tredwell, of Suffolk; Robert Yates and Peter Silvester, of the City and County of Albany; Gouverneur Morris, of

[1] *Journal of the Provincial Congress*, "Die Martis, 9 ho., A.M., May "30th, 1775."

[2] *Journal of the Provincial Congress*, "Die Martis, 9 ho., A.M., May "30, 1775."

[3] "10th.—That no question shall be determined on the day that it is "agitated, if three Counties shall request that it be deferred to the "next day."—(*Rules of the Congress*, in the *Journal of the Provincial Congress*, Tuesday, 23rd of May, 1775.)

[4] *Journal of the Provincial Congress*, "5 ho., P.M., May 30, 1775."

[5] *Journal of the Provincial Congress*, "Die Mercurii, 9 ho., A.M., May "31, 1775."

[6] *Journal of the Provincial Congress*, "Die Jovis, 9 ho., June 1, 1775."

Westchester County Ephraim Paine, of Dutchess-County; John Williams, of Queens-county; and Paul Michean, of Richmond-county—six of whom, including Messrs. Scott, McDougal, Hobart, Woodhull, Paine, and Troswell, were undoubtedly opposed to the entire movement—for a Committee, with instructions to "make report with all convenient speed," the subject rested, temporarily.[1]

It was not until the twenty-second of June, that the Committee was ready to report to the Provincial Congress the result of its deliberations on the subject which had been referred to it. On that day, the Report was presented, and read, twice, when the following very significant *Order* thereon was made by the Congress:

"ORDERED, That the same be taken into consider-"ation on Saturday morning next; that the mem-"bers of each County have leave to take one copy "thereof, each copy to be numbered by one of the "Secretaries, who shall take a memorandum of the "name of the member who shall take with him such "copy and the number of the copy by him taken, "that all such copies may, on Saturday next, be re-"turned to and filed with the Secretaries; and all "the members are directed by the President, from "the Chair, to take the utmost care to preserve the "said copies secret, and to keep secret the subject "matter thereof. And it is agreed that no member "shall transcribe the said Report, or take any copy "from the copies taken out of the House for the use "of the members of each County; and that all the "said copies shall, on Saturday next, be returned to "the Secretaries."[2]

On the following Saturday [*June* 24, 1775,] the Provincial Congress proceeded to consider the Report, agreeable to its *Order* made on the preceding Thursday; and, after the Report had been read and re-read, debated and amended, during the greater portion of that day and a portion of the following Tuesday, the proposed "*Plan of* Accommodation "with Great Britain," thus amended, was adopted, apparently with much cordiality, by all, except by those of the revolutionary faction.[3]

That very important paper, the "*Plan of Accommo-"dation with Great Britain*," which is essential to a proper understanding of the character of the doings of the Provincial Congress, at a later period of its existence, was, in its completed form, in these words:

"That all the Statutes and parts of Statutes of the "British Parliament, which are held up for repeal by "the late Continental Congress, in their *Association*, "dated the twentieth day of October, 1774, and all the "Statutes of the British Parliament, passed since that "day, restraining the Trade and Fishery of Colonies "on this Continent, ought to be repealed.

"That from the necessity of the case, Britain ought "to regulate the Trade of the whole Empire, for the "general benefit of the whole, and not for the sep-"arate interest of any particular part; and that, from "the natural Right of Property, the powers of Taxa-"tion ought to be confined to the Colony Legislatures, "respectively.

"THEREFORE, That the monies raised as Duties, "upon the Regulations of Trade, ought to be paid "into the respective Colony Treasuries, and be subject "to the disposal of their Deputies.

"That in those Colonies whose Representatives in "General Assembly are now chosen for a greater term "than three years, such Assemblies, for the future, "ought, in their duration, not to exceed that "term.

"That the Colonists are ready and willing to sup-"port the Civil Government within their respec-"tive Colonies; and, on proper requisitions, to "assist in the general defence of the Empire, in "as ample manner as their respective abilities will "admit.

"That if objections be made that a resort to a "variety of Colony Legislatures, for general aids, is "inconvenient, and that large, unappropriated Grants "to the Crown, from America, would endanger the "Liberty of the Empire, then the Colonies are ready "and willing to assent to a Continental Congress, "deputed from the several Colonies, to meet with a "President appointed by the Crown, for the purpose "of raising and apportioning their general aids, upon "application made by the Crown, according to the "advice of the British Parliament, to be judged of by "the said Congress.

"And as the free enjoyment of the Rights of Con-"science is, of all others, the most valuable branch of "human Liberty; and the indulgence and establish-"ment of Popery, all along the interior confines of "the old Protestant Colonies, tends not only to "obstruct their growth but weaken their security; "that neither the Parliament of Great Britain nor "any other earthly Legislature or Tribunal ought or "can interfere or interpose, in any wise, howsoever, "in the religious and ecclesiastical concerns of the "Colonies.

"That the Colonies, respectively, are entitled to a "free and exclusive power of legislation, within "themselves, respectively, in all cases of internal "polity, whatsoever, subject only to the negative of "their Sovereign, in such manner as has been, here-"tofore, accustomed.

"RESOLVED: That no one Article of the afore-"going Report be considered preliminary to another, "so as to preclude an accommodation without such "Article; and that no part of the said Report be

[1] *Journal of the Provincial Congress*, "Die Veneris, 9 ho., A.M., June 2, "1775."

[2] *Journal of the Provincial Congress*, "Die Jovis, 9 ho., A.M., June 22, "1775."

[3] "*Journal of the Provincial Congress*," 4 ho., P.M., Die Martis, June "27, 1775."

"deemed binding or obligatory upon the Repre-"sentatives of this Colony, in Continental Congress."[1]

The principles on which that *Plan* was constructed and the methods which were proposed for the execution of its provisions were so radically subversive of all the purposes for which Colonies were established and protected; so singularly presumptuous in claiming all the privileges and benefits enjoyed by Englishmen without assuming any of the burdens under which Englishmen were then staggering; so unaccountably inconsistent in conceding the authority of the Parliament to regulate their Trade and to levy Duties on their Imports while, at the same time, they denied the authority of that Parliament to impose Taxes on them, for general purposes, in the same manner and to the same extent and for the same purposes that it imposed similar Taxes on Englishmen, in England; so unduly arrogant in dictating to the Home Government and to the Parliament what they should do and what they should not do—including, in the former, a removal of all those obstructions to the "illicit Trade" of the Colonists, which that Home Government and that Parliament had interposed—as the price of their indirect proffer of an abandonment of their rebellious movements and of their return to their duties, as subjects of the Crown, that it is difficult to bring one's self to a belief that the framers and supporters of that proposed *Plan* were really sincere in proposing it, unless with the qualification that their enthusiasm and the seeming indifference of the Home and Colonial Governments had blinded them to its remarkable peculiarities, and induced them to regard the Colonists as something superior, in their political standing, to other subjects of the Crown—as something more than subjects, owing obedience to those in authority and to the Laws of the land. Such a *Plan*, had it been submitted to the Home Government and to the Parliament, would, unquestionably, have aggravated instead of conciliated, and have widened the breach which then separated the Colonies and the Mother Country, instead of closing it. It is serviceable, however, to the careful student of the history of that period, to indicate how much the Rebellion had already palled upon the senses of even those who were its local leaders; how much a reconciliation was secretly hankered for, even among those who were blustering in fictitious bravery; how much of hypocrisy there was among those who were loudly pretending to be "patriots," in harmony with similar "patriots" in each of the other Colonies, all of them zealously and noisily crowding the entire Continent into an open and unqualified Rebellion, while, at the same time, they were secretly determining, among themselves, by how slight a bond they were bound to their associates in crime, how delicately constructed were their honor and their patriotism, and at what price the Home Government could purchase their adherence and their "patriotism" and their sympathy with their compatriots, whenever that Home Government should incline to enter the market of "patriot-"ism," for such a purpose.

At a very early period, the security of the pass at Kingsbridge appears to have attracted the attention of the revolutionary faction; and measures were taken with the evident intention of throwing up some defensive works, at that point, for the protection of the City.

Immediately after the receipt of intelligence concerning the raid of the Royal troops on Lexington and Concord, without any formal order from the Committee of One hundred, great numbers of men were employed in hauling the cannon from the City to Kingsbridge, in readiness for the work of intrenchment;[2] and on the fourth of May, the Committee "ordered, that Captain Sears, Captain Randall, and "Captain Fleming be a Committee to procure proper "judges to go and view the ground at or near Kings-"bridge, and report to this Committee, with all "convenient speed, whether it will answer the pur-"poses intended by it"[3]—although they were not described, the "purposes" referred to were, evidently, for the protection of the City from any irruption, by land, from the country Towns.

The published *Proceedings of the Committee of One hundred*, in the City of New York, make no mention of the doings of that Committee; and it is not probable that it accomplished anything, in the way of fortifying Kingsbridge; but, on the twenty-fifth of May, the Continental Congress agreed to the following Resolutions, "respecting New York," one of which relates to the defence of Kingsbridge. These Resolutions were in the following words:

"1.—RESOLVED, That a Post be immediately taken "and fortified at or near King's-Bridge, in the Colony "of New-York; and that the ground be chosen with "a particular view to prevent the communication "between the City of New-York and the country "from being interrupted by land.

"2.—RESOLVED, that a Post be also taken in the "Highlands, on each side of Hudson's River, and Bat-"teries erected in such manner as will most effectual-"ly prevent any Vessels passing, that may be sent to "harass the Inhabitants on the borders of said River; "and that experienced persons be immediately sent "to examine said River, in order to discover where it "will be most advisable and proper to obstruct the "Navigation.

"3.—RESOLVED, That the Militia of New-York be "armed and trained, and in constant readiness to act

[1] *Journal of the Provincial Congress*, 4 ho., P. M., Pie Martis, June 27, 1775.

[2] *Proceedings of the Council of the Colony of New York*, "Monday, May 1, "1775."

[3] *Minutes of the Committee of One hundred*, Adjourned Meeting, "Thurs-"day morning, 11th May, 1775."

"at a moment's warning; and that a number of Men "be immediately enlisted, and kept in that City, and "so disposed of as to give protection to the Inhabit-"ants, in case any insult should be offered by the "Troops that may land there, and to prevent any "attempts that may be made to gain possession of "the City, and interrupt its intercourse with the "country.

"[Resolved.] "That it be left to the Provincial "Congress of New-York to determine the number of "men sufficient to occupy the several Posts above-"mentioned, and also that already recommended to be "taken at or near Lake George, as well as to guard the "City, *Provided*, the whole do not exceed the number "of three thousand men, to be commanded by such "officers as shall be thereunto appointed by said "Provincial Congress, and to be governed by such "Rules and Regulations as shall be established by said "Congress, until farther order is taken by this Con-"gress; *Provided*, also, that if the said Provincial "Congress should be of opinion that the number pro-"posed will not be sufficient for the several services "above recommended, that the said Congress report "their sentiments upon this subject to this Congress, "as soon as may be.

"5."—[Resolved.] "That it be recommended to "the said Provincial Congress, that in raising those "Forces, they allow no Bounties or Clothing, and "that their Pay shall not exceed the establishment "of the New-England Colonies.

"6."—[Resolved.] "That it be further recom-"mended to the Provincial Congress, aforesaid, that "the Troops be enlisted to serve until the last day "of December next, unless this Congress shall direct "that they be sooner disbanded."[1]

On the following day, [*May* 26, 1775,] the Continental Congress further "Resolved, That it be recom-"mended to the Congress aforesaid, to persevere the "more vigorously in preparing for their defence, as it "is very uncertain whether the earnest endeavours of "this Congress to accommodate the unhappy differences "between Great Britain and the Colonies, by concilia-"tory measures, will be successful;" and, in addition, it "Ordered, That the above Resolves, respecting "New-York, be transmitted by the President in a let-"ter, to the Provincial Congress of New-York; and "that it be particularly recommended to said Con-"gress, by the President, not to publish the foregoing "Resolves, but to keep them as secret as the nature of "the case requires."[2]

On the twenty-ninth of May, the Resolutions which had been thus adopted by the Continental Congress, were received by the Provincial Congress;[3] and on the following day, on motion of John Morin Scott, of the City of New-York, they were taken into consideration—that portion of them which directed the fortifying of Kingsbridge, was referred to Captain Richard Montgomery, of Duchess-county, Henry Glenn and Robert Yates, of Albany-county, and Colonel James Van Cortlandt and Colonel James Holmes, of Westchester-county, with orders "to view "the ground at or near King's Bridge, and report to "this Congress whether the ground near King's "Bridge will admit of making a fortification there, "that will be tenable; and at what particular place "the ground will admit of making the best and "most tenable fortification; and that they call to "their assistance such persons as they shall think "necessary, and make report to this Congress, with all "convenient speed:" that portion of them which directed the erection of fortifications in the Highlands, on the Hudson-river, was referred to Colonel James Clinton and Christopher Tappan, both of Ulster-county, with orders to "take to their assistance "such persons as they shall think necessary; to go to "the Highlands, and view the banks of Hudson's "river there; and to report to this Congress the most "proper place for erecting one or more fortifications; "and, likewise, an estimate of the expense that will "attend erecting the same."[4]

Both these Resolutions were initiatory of prolonged and not always harmonious and agreeable proceedings, both without and within the Provincial Congress and both without and within the Congress of the Continent, all of which can be considered with greater propriety in the local publications concerning the Towns of Kingsbridge and Cortlandt and in the general publications concerning the War of the American Revolution, than in a general *History of the County of Westchester;* and, for that reason and with this introductory send-off, the construction of those military works to which the Resolutions referred will receive no further attention, in this narrative.

On the thirty-first of May, in its further consideration of the Resolutions of the Continental Congress, which have been already laid before the reader, the Provincial Congress resolved, "that it be recommended "to the Inhabitants of this Colony, in general, im-"mediately to furnish themselves with necessary arms "and ammunitions; to use all diligence to perfect "themselves in the military art; and, if necessary, to "form themselves into Companies, for that purpose, "until the further order of the Congress;" and it ordered the Resolution to be printed in the newspapers and in handbills. At the same time, it met the call of the Continental Congress, for men to occupy the proposed posts at Kingsbridge and in the Highlands, for the protection of the City of New York, and for that of Lake George, referred to in the third and fourth Resolutions of that Congress, by resolving that it "would use all possible diligence in

[1] *Journal of the Continental Congress*, "Thursday, May 25, 1775."

[2] *Journal of the Continental Congress*, "Friday, May 26, 1775."

[3] *Journal of the Provincial Congress*, "Dies Lunæ, 4 ho., P.M., May "29th, 1775."

[4] *Journal of the Provincial Congress*, "5 ho., P.M., May 30, 1775."

"embodying men according to the said Resolutions;" and by appointing a Committee "to report an ar-"rangement of the troops to be embodied for the "defence of this Colony; and to report such *Rules* "*and Regulations* as would be proper to be established "by this Congress, for the government of such "troops."[1]

The doings of the Provincial Congress were, of course, entirely in the interest of the Rebellion.

* * * * * * * *

Early in the Summer, as has been stated, the Continental Congress ordered the enlistment of a large armed force, of which three thousand were to be raised and put into the field by the Colony of New York. These troops were to be commanded by such Officers as should be thereunto appointed by the Provincial Congress; they were to be governed by such *Rules and Regulations* as that Congress should establish for that purpose; they were to be mustered into the service, to serve no longer than the last day of the succeeding December;[2] and as there was no enemy before them, and as little probability existed that there would be any one to molest them, during their short term of service, the proffered opportunity to take the field, as Continental Soldiers, appeared to be very inviting—it seemed, in fact, to promise what would be little else than an organized picnic-party, for the succeeding Summer and Autumn and early Winter months.

There were, of course, plenty of applications from those of the well-born, among the revolutionary faction and from among those who had been instrumental in bringing the Livingstons and the Morrises and others into authority, for each of the offices, in each of the four Regiments into which the levy on New York was arranged; but there was an evident backwardness, among the masses, from the beginning, in enlisting for "the private station;" there was a greater anxiety, among those who did enlist, concerning their pay and bounty and "under clothes," than for the welfare of the Colony; and, generally, there was very little inclination, any where, among those who had them, to exchange their peaceful occupations and their domestic comforts and their quiet homes, under such circumstances as then existed, for a distant encampment or a distant military post and the sometimes laborious and not always well-supplied and always irregular lives of soldiers, in garrison as well as in the field.

Of the four Regiments thus ordered, on the Continental Establishment, only the Fourth, or Duchess, appears to have had any connection with Westchester-county—James Holmes, of Bedford, an experienced soldier of the former War, was its Colonel;[3] and Philip Van Cortlandt, of Cortlandt Manor, who held, also, a Royal Commission of Major in the Colonial Militia, was its Lieutenant-colonel;[4] Barnabas Tuthill, of Southold, Suffolk county, was its Major;[5] Benjamin Chapman was its Quarter-master; and Ebenezer Haviland was its Surgeon.[6] Of the ten Companies of which the Regiment was composed, three were largely from Westchester-county—of one of these Jonathan Platt, of Bedford, was Captain,[7] David Dan, of Poundridge, was First Lieutenant;[8] and Manning Bull, of ———, was Second Lieutenant: of another of those Companies, Daniel Mills, of Bed-

---

[1] *Journal of the Provincial Congress*, "Die Mercurii, 9 ho., A.M., May "31st, 1775."

[2] *Journal of the Continental Congress*, "Thursday, May 25, and Friday, "May 26, 1775—pages 98, 99, ante.

[3] James Holmes was the grandson of one of the original proprietors and settlers of the Town of Bedford. He was born in that Town, in 1737; and a Captain in the Army, during the War with France, in which he gained great credit. He was elected to the Provincial Convention for the appointment of Delegates to the Continental Congress of 1774; and he was a member of the Provincial Congress, by whom he was made Colonel of this Regiment. He went with his Regiment to the northern frontier, and occupied Ticonderoga, very much to his disgust; quarrelled with General Schuyler, who commanded in that Department; declined to continue in the service, after the term of the enlistment of his command had expired; became a Loyalist; took the Lieutenant-colonelcy of the Corps of the Westchester-county Refugees; continued to live in Bedford, until about 1810, when he removed to New Haven, where he died, on the eighth of July, 1824, aged eighty-seven years.

An extended notice of him may be seen in Jones's *History of New York during the Revolutionary War*, ii., 324-326; and, in his *Notes* to that History (ii., 618-621,) Mr. de Lancey has re-produced, in full, an exceedingly interesting autobiographical tract, from the Colonel's own pen.

[4] Philip Van Cortlandt, eldest son of Pierre Van Cortlandt, was born in the City of New York, in 1749 (?), and was a graduate of King's (now Columbia) College, in the class of 1768 (?). He was a Surveyor and a Country Merchant and Miller; a Major in the Westchester-county Militia, under Governor Tryon; and a member of the Provincial Congress by whom he was made Lieutenant-colonel of this Regiment. He continued in the military service, until the close of the War of the Revolution; after which he was one of the Commissioners of Forfeitures; represented Westchester-county in the Assembly, 1788-'9, 1789-'90; the Southern District, in the Senate, 1791-'4; his District, in Congress, 1792-1809; and died on the twenty-first of November, 1831.—(Bolton's *History of Westchester-county*, original edition, i., 58-60; *the same*, second edition, i., 111-112; etc.)

[5] Barnabas Tuthill was a resident of Southold; had not joined the Regiment, which was then at Ticonderoga, as late as the first of September, when he was in New York City, "unable to proceed for want of "money to pay his expenses." He appears to have returned to the service, in 1776; but, during the Summer, he was dismissed from the Army, at his own request.—(*Journal of the Provincial Congress*, "4 ho., P.M., "September 1st, 1775;" *General McDougal to Robert Yates*, "YONKERS, "21 October, 1776.")

[6] The Roster of the entire Regiment may be seen in the *Historical Manuscripts relating to the War of the Revolution—Military Committee*, xxv., 531—in the office of the Secretary of State, at Albany.

[7] Jonathan Platt was an aged man, whom Mr. Bolton has erroneously made the great-grandfather of Hon. Lewis C. Platt of White Plains; he was Mr. Platt's grand-Uncle. He was elected a Delegate to the Provincial Convention called to elect Deputies to the Continental Congress of 1774; he was a member of the first County Committee of Westchester-county, in 1775; and a member of the fourth Provincial Congress, or, as it was called after a while, the Provincial Convention—that which declared the Independence of New York from the King of Great Britain, which had not been done by the Congress, at Philadelphia, on the fourth of July, 1776.

[8] David Dan was a member of the first County Committee of Westchester-county, in 1775, and a member of the Town Committee of Poundridge, in 1776. He was appointed to the command of a Company, in Colonel Thomas's Regiment, in August, 1776.

ford, was Captain;[1] Elijah Hunter, of the same Town, was First Lieutenant;[2] and John Bayley, of ———, was Second Lieutenant:[3] of the remaining Company, Ambrose Horton, apparently from the White Plains, was Captain;[4] David Palmer, of ———, was First Lieutenant;[5] and Samuel Tredwell Pell, of ———, was Second Lieutenant.[6] The names of none of those who held Warrants, as Non-commissioned Officers, in either of these Companies, have been preserved; and it is to be regretted that, except in the instance of the Bedford Company, the names of those who were in the ranks, as Privates, are no longer known. A considerable number of the latter classes, with no other claim to distinction than their physical ability to work or to fight and their good intentions, was probably taken from the yeomanry of Westchester-county; and, notwithstanding they were mostly detained at Ticonderoga, without having been permitted to join General Montgomery, before Quebec, as he particularly desired and requested they should do, there is no reason for supposing that they failed, in the slightest degree, to discharge every duty which was laid on them, satisfactorily to their commanding Officers. Some of them are said to have served in Canada;[7] but it is understood that the Regiment was discharged, at the close of the term for which it had been enlisted; and that the greater number returned, with honor, to their respective homes.

It will be remembered that the Continental Congress, among the Resolutions relating to the Colony of New York, which it adopted on the twenty-fifth and twenty-sixth of May,[8] included a requisition "that the Militia of New-York be armed and trained "and in constant readiness to act at a moment's "warning," etc.; and that those Resolutions were duly transmitted to the Provincial Congress of that Colony.[9] After a prolonged consideration of the subject, by two Committees and by the body of the Provincial Congress,[10] on the ninth of August, a Report was made and adopted, providing for the complete re-organization of the Militia of the Colony, and for a complete change in the *personnel* of those who commanded it.[11] On the twenty-second of the same

[1] Captain Daniel Mills continued in the service, after the Regiment was disbanded, at the close of the year, serving as a Captain in Colonel Van Schaick's Regiment of the New York Line, in the Continental Army.

[2] Elijah Hunter was originally named for Second Lieutenant, with Samuel Haight, subsequently Sheriff of the County, as First Lieutenant. He was a member of the County Committee, representing Bedford, 1776-7; subsequently became a Captain in Van Cortlandt's Regiment; and left the service at the close of 1776.

[3] John Bayley evidently left the Regiment before it went into active service, since, in August, 1775, Miles Oakley, a member of the first County Committee, was appointed in his place, leaving the service at the end of the year.

The following paper, with the names of the men enlisted into this Company, is taken from the original manuscript, among the *Historical Manuscripts relating to the War of the Revolution: Military Returns*, xxvii., 266; and will be interesting to those who have descended from the older families of Bedford:

"BEADFORD, July 29th, 1775.

"*A Return of the Men inlisted by Daniel Mills Capt. and Elijah Hunter first Leut.*

"Abijah Dan,	Abijah Weed,
"Jonathan Weeks,	John thomas,
"willis major wilks,	Lewis Miller,
"John feris,	James trowbridg,
"James Raymond, Junr	Joseph Clarke, Junr
"John Bud,	John ellit, Junr
"Amos Roberts,	James Cannady,
"Henry Rich,	John Gosseper,
"Abram Nickels,	James Miller,
"Nathanel Smith,	Nathan Holmes,
"Mosis Higgins,	John Runnelds,
"ebenezer weeb,	William Miller,
"Charles parsons,	Daniel Holmes,
"Ambres Benedick,	Jeremiah Lane,
"James Bennet,	Giddeon Smith,
"Daniel McClean,	Zephaniah Millier,
"Lemuel Light,	Isaac titus,
"James Mills,	John Daniels,
"Thomas Golding,	John Still,
"Joseph Sears,	George Garret,
"Lowran Brinney,	Holmes astin,
"newman wayrin,	newman betts,
"Timothy Conner,	John Bayly,
"Henry Noole,	Shubel Cunninggame,
"John Cunninggame,	Patrick Cuhana.

"Total 59.

"To PETER V. B. LIVINGSTON, Esqr

"*President, of ye New York Provincial Congress.*"

[4] There is some reason for supposing that Ambrose Horton was imported from Southold, in Suffolk-county, to take the command of a Company in this Regiment; but, wherever he may have originated, he enlisted "fifty-six able bodyed men" for the Company; and reported them to the Provincial Congress, from the White Plains, on the twenty-sixth of July, 1775, (*Historical Manuscripts*, etc.: *Military Returns*, xxvi., 57.) Unfortunately, he did not return the names of those enlisted men.

[5] The First Lieutenancy of this Company was originally given to Samuel Clannon, who appears to have given way for David Palmer, apparently from Duchess-county; and, in August, 1775, the latter was again raised, by being appointed to the command of a Company, in this Regiment. While he held the Lieutenancy, he enlisted twenty-three men for this Company, in Richmond-county, (*Historical Manuscripts*, etc.: *Military Returns*, xxvi., 53.)

[6] The Second Lieutenancy of this Company was originally given to Nehemiah Marshall; but, in July, 1775, that gentleman withdrew and Mr. Pell was appointed to the vacancy. The latter was evidently promoted to the First Lieutenancy, when, in August of that year, Lieutenant Palmer was promoted to the command of a Company; and, on the same day, Isaac Van Waert was appointed to the vacant Second Lieutenancy.

[7] Captain David Palmer, Lieutenant Samuel T. Pell, and Lieutenant Isaac Van Waert are particularly noticed as having served in Canada, in 1775, (*Historical Manuscripts*, etc.: *Military Committee's Papers*, xxv., 761; *the same*; *Military Returns*, xxvii., 165;) and it may reasonably be supposed that the Company of which they were Officers, accompanied them.

[8] *Journal of the Continental Congress*, "Thursday, May 25, and Friday, "May 26, 1775," pages 98, 99, ante.

[9] *Journal of the Provincial Congress*, "Die Lunæ, 4 ho., P.M., May 29th, "1775."

[10] *Journal of the Provincial Congress*, "Die Veneris, 9 ho., A.M., July 7, "1775;" *the same*, "Die Jovis, 9 ho., A.M., July 27, 1775;" *the same*, "Die Lunæ, 9 ho., A.M., August 7, 1775;" and *the same*, "Die Mercurii, "9 ho., A.M., August 9, 1775."

[11] *Journal of the Provincial Congress*, "Die Mercurii, 9 ho., A.M., "August 9, 1775."

month, with a very important change, which permitted those who were not residents of the Districts or Beats to take and to hold offices therein, that Report was included in an elaborate "*Militia Bill*," which provided that every portion of the Colony should be divided into "Districts or Beats," in such manner that each of those Districts should include, as nearly as possible, eighty-three men and boys, between sixteen and sixty years of age, and capable of bearing arms. These Companies were to be commanded by Officers to be elected by the respective Companies, and commissioned by the Provincial Congress. One fourth of the entire force was to be organized as Minute-men; the Companies were to be organized into Regiments; the Regiments were to be organized into Brigades; and all were to be commanded by a Major-general, to be appointed and commissioned by the Provincial Congress. Provisions were also made requiring "every man, between the ages of sixteen "and fifty," to provide himself with a musket and bayonet, a sword or tomahawk, a cartridge-box to contain twenty-three rounds of cartridges, a knapsack, one pound of gunpowder, and three pounds of balls; and various other provisions, for the government of the Militia, were also enacted.[1]

There does not appear to have been much discontent, in any part of the Colony, because of the passage of that Ordinance or Act for the re-organization of the Militia; but it afforded opportunities, in various places, for displays of that contempt for the unfranchised and lowly masses, which those of higher social and political rank, even those who were ostentatiously assuming to be the especial guardians and defenders of the Rights of the Colonists, were not slow in presenting to the world. A notable instance of this contempt was seen at Yonkers, where Frederick Van Cortlandt, an unprovided-for member of that extended family, aspired to the command of the Company in that Beat, probably as a stepping-stone to something better. The enrolled members of the Company, in whom the right of election rested, preferred one of their own number, John Cock, for their Captain; and when the Poll was closed, it was found that the aristocratic aspirant had received only eleven votes, while his plebeian opponent had received forty-eight, and one had been given to William Betts.[2] The defeated aspirant subsequently complained that, although his successful opponent had signed the *Association*, he had done so without having heartily approved it, supporting his charge with an affidavit of William Hadley,[3] who had aspired to the First Lieutenancy of the Company, and had received only twelve of the sixty votes which were cast for that office;[4] and, of course, the Committee of Safety of the County transmitted the affidavit to the Provincial Congress, promising to supplement what was then sent with evidence that Cock had "spoken very dis-"respectfully of the Congress;" and inviting that body to withhold the Commission to which Cock was entitled under the provisions of the Congress's own enactment.[5] Six days afterwards, fifty-nine of the Inhabitants of Yonkers presented a Petition to the Committee of Safety, justifying their action in electing Cock as their Captain, and asking that he might be commissioned, as such;[6] but Isaac Green, one of

[1] That "Militia Bill," *in extenso*, was published as a Note to the *Journal of the Provincial Congress*, "Die Martis, 9 ho., A.M., August 22, "1775."

[2] *Votes of the Militia Embodyed in ye Precinct of the Yonkers and of officers names this 24 August*, 1775.—*Historical Manuscripts*, etc.: *Military Returns*, xxvi., 23; xxvii., 263.

[3] "WESTCHESTER COUNTY, ss.

"William Hadley, of the said County, yeoman, personally appeared "before the Committee of Safety for the County aforesaid, and being "duly sworn on the Holy Evangelists of the Almighty God, saith that "he the Deponent being appointed one of the Sub-Committee for the "superintending the signing of the *General Association* of this Province, "carried the same to one, John Cock, of the Yonkers, in said County, "and asked the said John Cock to sign the same; he, the said John "Cock taking the pen in his hand uttered the following words: 'I sign "'this with my hand, but not with my heart, for I would not have "'signed it had it not been for my wife and family's sake;' and this he "several times repeated in the hearing of him the Deponent. And "further the Deponent saith not.

"WILLIAM HADLEY.

"Sworn the 11th Sept., 1775,
"before me,
"GILBT DRAKE."

[4] *Votes of the Militia Embodyed*, etc.—*Historical Manuscripts*, etc., *Military Returns*, xxvi., 23; xxvii., 263.

[5] *Letter from Gilbert Drake, Chairman, to John Haring, Chairman of the Committee of Safety, at New York*, "WHITE-PLAINS, Sept. 11th, 1775."

[6] *Journal of the Committee of Safety*, "Die Lunæ, 9 ho., A.M., Septem-"ber 18, 1775."

The Petition thus presented has been preserved; and the following has been copied from it—*Historical Manuscripts*, etc., *Petitions*, xxxi., 191.

"TO THE HONBLE THE PROVINCIAL CONGRESS OF THE PROVINCE OF NEW "YORK IN THE CITY OF NEW YORK CONVENT—OR IN THEIR RECESS, "TO THE HONBLE THE COMMITTEE OF SAFETY.

"The Honorable Petition of the Inhabitants of the Precinct of the "lower Yonkers in the County of Westchester Humbly Sheweth:

"That your Honourable House have made a Resolve and Published "the same Recommending to the Inhabitants of every Town Manner "Precinct & District within the Province aforesaid, to meet nominate "and appoint Captains and Other Officers To form Themselves in Com-"panys of Militia.

"And whereas the Inhabitants of this Precinct Did meet agreeable to "your said Resolve On the Twenty-fourth Day of August Last, under "the Inspection of the Commitee for that District Did by a very great "Majority as by the List will appear, Did Nominate and appoint Mr. "John Cock of the said Precinct for his known Skill and ability in the "Military Discipline and for other good Cause, appointed him Captain "of the said Company for the District aforesaid.

"And whereas we are informed that a Complaint hath been made to "the Commitee by a few of the Inhabitants against the said Mr. John "Cock out of Spite and Malice and as we conceive what has been alegd "against him was before the Signing the Association, we are well "assured that Since his Signing the said Association no person Can ac-"cuse him of breaking the same by any ways or means whatever.

"Therefore we the Petitioners and Subscribers Do Humbly beg the "Indulgence of This Honourable House To Grant unto Mr. John Cock "the Commission of Captain for the Company aforesaid as we are Con-"vinced he was choosen agreeable to your said Resolve and your Peti-"tioners as in Duty Bound shall ever pray.

those who had voted for Cock, at the Election, was induced to join with George Hadley, the latter in a second Affidavit, showing that Cock "had damned the "Provincial Congress of this Colony, and spoke dis-"respectfully of them;" and these were laid before the Colonial Committee of Safety, in opposition to the Petition of the fifty-nine and to the claim of the Captain-elect. The result was probably foreseen by the Petitioners and their successful candidate—why should the carefully expressed will of fifty-nine respectable men, declared in conformity with the published terms of the Congress itself, be permitted to stand in the way of a Van Cortlandt, the latter with nothing else than two *ex-parte* Affidavits to sustain the evidently ridiculous charge of wrong-doing in the successful candidate? and why, also, should those other successful candidates who had, also, been elected by the same great majority and at the same time, without even the semblance of an accusation against either of them, be permitted to receive their Commissions? It was true, that the latter had not been known to have spoken disrespectfully of either the *Association* or of the Congress: it was true, that they had received nearly five-sixths of the votes which were cast: it was true, that the Election had been held under the inspection of the proper Committee: it was true, that every requirement of the Congress's own enactments had been duly observed: it was also true, however, that they were obnoxious to "a few "of the Inhabitants," and, therefore, without an accusation, without a hearing, without a shadow of authority, even in the elastic law of the Congress, the expressed will of the Company was disregarded and the pretended principles of the Revolution were thrown aside, by the refusal of the Committee of Safety to recognize either of the successful candidates, and by the issue of an order for a new Election,[1] which, if it was held, was not held until the following March.

With "the letter of the *Militia Regulations*," as has been said, there did not appear to be any extended discontentment; but with the arbitrary conduct of some of those who were to oversee the execution of it —the instance, at Yonkers, being only one of several —there was, very reasonably, much dissatisfaction among those, being men from whom duties were exacted, who were, nevertheless, regarded and treated as if they were not men, and as if they possessed no social or political privilege which those who were better born were legally obliged to recognize and respect.

In a community, such as that which constituted Colonial Westchester-county, which was already known and distinguished because of its consistent conservatism and, therefore, because of its backwardness in promoting the cause of the Rebellion, such a tyrannical exercise of political authority as had been seen in connection with the Election of Militia Officers, at Yonkers, by those who were, themselves, exercising only an authority which had been usurped and which was held and exercised without due warrant in law, was everything else than conciliatory, and was far better adapted to arouse and to inflame

"Charles Tylor,
"Martin Post,
"James Munro,
"Anthy Allaire,
"Edward Fyer,
"Benjamin Farrington,
"William Rose,
"Henry presher,
"Thomas Farington,
"Isac Postt,
"James Rich,
"Gilbert Brown,
his
"Thomas X Tippit,
mark,
"Samuel Laurence,
"thomas Merrell,
"Samuel Williams,
"Fredrick Brown,
"Israel Underhill,
"David Oakley, Junr,
"Joseph Oakley, Junr,
"George Crawford,
"Moses Oakley,
"Abraham Rich,
"Mathious Archer,
his
"Fzk X Brown,
mark,
his
"Abraham X Asten,
mark,
"Robert Farrington,
his
"John X Odle,
mark
his
"Abm X Odle,
mark
"Lower Yonkers, Septr 15, 1775."

John Devoe,
Jacob Post,
Henry Brown,
Henrey Taylor,
Anthoney Archer,
Basal Archer,
Thomas Oakley,
Jonathan Fowler,
his
Abm X Post,
mark
his
Dennis X Post,
mark
his
William X Post,
mark
Robert Brown,
Danel Deen,
Stephen Bastine,
Benjm Arsdan,
Henry Norris,
John Guevnau,
Thomas Rich,
Elijh taylor,
Jacob Taylor,
James Crawford,
Elnathan Taylor,
Isrel Post,
his
Lewis X post,
mark
John Warner,
Francis Smith,
Jordan Norris,
frederick Vermilyea,
John Cortright,
Edward Cortright.

[1] *Journal of the Committee of Safety*, "Die Martis, 9 ho., A.M., Septem-"ber 19th, 1775."

The following letter, addressed by the Colonial Committee of Safety to Frederic Van Cortlandt and others, informing them of the remarkable result of this Election, in Yonkers, will interest those who desire to learn the inside history of the Revolution, in Westchester-county:

"In Committee of Safety,
"New-York, Sept. 19th, 1775.

"Gentlemen:

"Having considered your report, and also the report of "your County Committee, concerning the Election of John Cox, as "a Captain of the Company of Militia at Yonkers. We have determined "him to be disqualified for a Commission, not only because at the time "of his signing the *Association* he declared it to be an involuntary act, but "also because he has spoke most contemptuously of the Provincial Con-"gress. And in order that the other Officers in the Company may have "a chance of promotion, which cannot be done according to the letter of "the *Militia Regulations*, you are hereby desired to cause a new Election "to be made of all the Officers of the Company, pursuant to the said "*Regulations*, taking care to give public notice that the said John Cocks "cannot be admitted to any office whatsoever.

"We are respectfully, Gentlemen,
"Your very humble Servants,
"By order of the Committee of Safety,
"John Haring, *Chairman*.

"To Frederic V Cortlandt, Benjamin "Drake, Stephen Sneden, Thomas Em-"mons, William Betts and William "Hadley, at Yonkers, Westchester."

the passions of those who were loyal to the universally recognized Sovereign and obedient to the public Laws of the land, than to soothe them. But the farmers of the County were generally peaceable men, preferring to endure a wrong instead of resenting and resisting it by force; and they appear to have generally proceeded, therefore, to the election of Officers, in the reorganized Militia of the County, with much unanimity and general good feeling. The first to respond to the call of the Provincial Congress, by the election of its Militia Officers, was the Borough Town of Westchester, where, on the twenty-fourth of August, John Oakley was elected to the command of the local Company,[1] with Nicholas Berrian, for its First Lieutenant;[2] Isaac Leggett, for its Second Lieutenant; and Frederic Philipse Stevenson, for its Ensign.[3] Subsequently, when West Farms and the Manor of Fordham were separated from the body of the Town and made a separate and distinct Beat, Nicholas Berrian was elected to the command of the new Company, with Gilbert Taylor, for its First Lieutenant; Daniel Devoe, for its Second Lieutenant; and Benjamin Valentine, for its Ensign.[4]

In the Manor of Cortlandt, there were eight Districts or Beats, which appear to have been the same, in their several territorial limits, as those under the former arrangement; and these elected the following Officers for the respective Companies:

The District formerly commanded by Francis Lent elected James Kronkhyte, for its Captain; Abraham Lamb, for its First Lieutenant; Staats De Grote, for its Second Lieutenant; and David Penore, for its Ensign.

The District formerly commanded by Barton Underhill elected Gilbert Van Cortlandt, for its Captain; Daniel Hains, for its First Lieutenant;[5] James Taller, for its Second Lieutenant; and Haramanos Gardinear minor, or "Third," for its Ensign.

The District formerly commanded by Jeremiah Drake elected Gilbert Lockwood, for its Captain; John Drake, for its First Lieutenant;[6] Joshua Drake, for its Second Lieutenant;[7] and Peter Carman, for its Ensign.[8]

The District formerly commanded by David Montros declined to make a new Election; and its Officers under the former arrangement appear to have been retained and to have received new Commissions.

The District formerly commanded by Ebenezer Theall elected Andrew Brown, for its Captain; Samuel Haight, for its First Lieutenant;[9] John Chrissey Miller, for its Second Lieutenant; and Solomon Purdy, for its Ensign.

The northern division of the District formerly commanded by Levi Baily elected Nathaniel Delevan, for its Captain;[10] Thomas Nicholls, Junior, for its First

---

[1] John Oakley represented Westchester, in the County Committee, from May, 1776, until May, 1777.

[2] Nicholas Berrian was one of those, at Fordham and West Farms, who, in September, 1775, petitioned for the establishment of a Company, in that portion of the Town, separate from the other portions of it, (*Historical Manuscripts*, etc.: *Petitions*, xxxi. 114); and, in October of the same year, when that Petition was granted, he was elected to the command of the new Company, (*Historical Manuscripts*, etc. *Military Returns*, xxvi., 234.)

[3] *Historical Manuscripts relating to the War of the Revolution: Military Returns*, xxvi., 23; xxvii., 263.

[4] *Historical Manuscripts relating to the War of the Revolution: Military Returns*, xxvi., 234.

The following list of the names of those, from West Farms and the Manor of Fordham, who were summoned to meet at Westchester; who petitioned for the organization of the new Company; and who were its members, when it was organized, may properly find a place in this narrative. It was copied from the original manuscript, (*Historical Manuscripts, Petitions*, xxxi., 114.)

Nicholas Berrian,
Isaac Valintine,
Peter Valintine,
John Stevens,
Benjamin Curser [*Corsa?*]
Abraham Dyckman,
John Turner,
Benjamin Valentine,
his
Georg .X Philipet,
mark
Isaac Valintine, Junior,
Peter Bussing, Junr,
Peter Bussing,
Abraham Wils,
Benjamin Curser, Jr.,
Hendrick Ryer,
John Lint, [*Lent?*]
John Ryer,
Isaac Corser, [*Corsa?*]
Isaac Corser, Junr,
tunus Leforge,
Philip Hunt,
Stephen Embree,
Nathaniel Lawrence,
Peter Devoe,
James McKay,
Robert Campbell,
Eden Hunt,
Isaac Hunt,
James Archer,
Samuel Embree, Junr,
Edward Harris.
John Collard,
Cornelius Jacobs,
hezekiah Ward,
Tunis Garrison,
Isack Cant,
Gilbert Taylor,
Robert Gilmer,
Benjamin Archer, Junr,
Daniel Devoe, Junr,
John Embree, Senr,
Jacob Lent,
his
Abram X Lent,
mark
Dennis Ryer,
Jacob Valentine,
Abraham garison,
James Grobe,
John Embree, Junr,
James Swaim,
Nazareth Breuer,
Thomas Hunt,
Abram Leggett,
William Leggett,
John Leggett, Junr,
Robert Hunt, Junr,
Cornelius Leggett,
Mr. Woods,
John Hedger,
Thomas Hedger,
Stephen Edwards,
James Rock,
George Higby,
Jacob Hunt,
Levi Hunt,
Jeremiah Regen,
Thomas Cromwell,
Gerrardus Cromwell,
Obadiah Hide,
John Cursor,
Sirion Williams,
John Ryer, Junr,
Jacob Chappel,
John Garrison,
John Jacobs,
Thomas Dogherty,
John Clark,
John Devoe,
John Blizard,
John Walbrin,
John Warnick,
Thomas Gemble.

[5] David Hains did not sign the *Association* until the day of the Election

[6] John Drake did not sign the *Association* until the day of the Election.

[7] Joshua Drake did not sign the *Association* until the day of the Election. He was subsequently made an Ensign in the Continental Service; but soon became tired and resigned, and brought influences to bear in order to secure a Lieutenancy in the same service, in which latter operation, however, he does not seem to have been successful.

[8] Peter Carman, also, did not sign the *Association* until the day of the Election.

[9] Samuel Haight represented Westchester-county, in the Assembly of the State, 1782–'3, 1784, 1789–'90, 1791, 1792; he was Sheriff of the County, 1792–'6; and he was one of the Senators from the Southern District, 1797–1809. In 1800, he represented the Southern District in the Council of Appointment.

[10] Nathaniel Delevan represented Westchester-county in the Assembly of the State, 1781–'2.

Lieutenant; Titus Runnels, for its Second Lieutenant; and Abraham Purdy, for its Ensign.[1] The southern division of the same former District elected Gideon Selah [*Seeley?*] for its Captain, Samuel Lawrence for its First Lieutenant; Caleb Hobby, for its Second Lieutenant;[2] and Abraham Todd, for its Ensign.

The District formerly commanded by Joseph Strang[3] elected John Hyatt, for its Captain;[4] John Drake, for its First Lieutenant;[5] Obediah Purdy, for its Second Lieutenant; and Joseph Horton, for its Ensign.[6]

The eight Companies, in the Manor of Cortlandt, which were thus reorganized and re-officered, were known as the North Battalion of Westchester-county, of which, soon afterwards, Pierre Van Cortlandt was made Colonel,[7] Gilbert Drake its Lieutenant-colonel,[8] Joseph Strang its First Major,[9] Ebenezer Purdy its Second Major,[10] John Cooley its Adjutant, and Isaac Norton its Quartermaster.[11]

The District of Eastchester elected Stephen Sneden, for its Captain;[12] Thomas Pinkney, for its First Lieutenant;[13] Daniel Sebring, for its Second Lieutenant;[14] and William Pinkney, for its Ensign.[15] For some reason which is not now known, a new Election was held in the following March, when Thomas Pinkney was made its Captain, William Pinkney its First Lieutenant, John Sneden its Second Lieutenant, and William Reed its Ensign.[16]

New Rochelle and the Manor of Pelham, united, formed a District or Beat; and it elected Joseph Drake, for its Captain;[17] James Willis, for its First Lieutenant;[18] and David Gnion, for its Second Lieutenant. It did not elect an Ensign.

The Manor of Philipsborough included six distinct Districts or Beats—the Upper, the East, the Lower, the Yonkers, the Tarrytown, and the Associated Company, in the upper part of the Manor—and these elected the following Officers in their several Districts:

The Upper District elected Abraham Ledew, for its Captain;[19] Benjamin Brown, for its First Lieutenant; John Relyea, for its Second Lieutenant; and John Oakley, for its Ensign. John Relyea having declined the proffered Second Lieutenancy, Jonas Arsor [*Orsor?*] was subsequently elected to fill the vacancy.[20]

The East Company elected David Davids, for its Captain: Benjamin Vermilyea, for its First Lieutenant; Gilbert Dean, for its Second Lieutenant; and Gabriel Reguaw, [*Requa?*] for its Ensign.[21] Captain-elect Davids appears to have declined the proffered office; and, at a subsequent Election, the Company elected Benjamin Vermilyea, for its Captain; Gilbert Dean, for its First Lieutenant; and William Fushie, [*Forshee?*] to its Second Lieutenancy; Ensign Requa evidently retaining the Office to which he had been originally appointed.[22]

The Lower Company elected Isaac Vermilyea, for its

---

[1] Abraham Purdy was a member of the County Committee, representing the Manor of Cortlandt, in 1776–7, (*Historical Manuscripts*, etc.: *Miscellaneous Papers*, xxxviii., 309.)

[2] In April, 1776, Caleb Hobby, who was said to have been a "Gentleman," received a Commission from the Continental Congress, as First Lieutenant in "the First Regiment of New York Forces," (*Historical Manuscripts*, etc.: *Military Returns*, xxvii., 101): and he appears to have joined the Seventh, or Captain Hait's, Company, (*Historical Manuscripts*, etc.: *Military Commissions*, xxv., 165, 676.) Soon afterwards, it was said that he and the Second Lieutenant and the Ensign of the Company [*Hait's or Hyatt's*] "wish to decline the service; they will be no loss to "it." (*Historical Manuscripts*, etc.: *Military Committee's Papers*, xxv., 188.)

[3] Joseph Strang was subsequently made First Major of the Regiment, the Third of the Westchester-county Militia, of which the eight Companies in the Manor of Cortlandt appear to have been members, (*Historical Manuscripts*, etc.: *Military Returns*, xxvi., 13.) He represented the County in the Assembly of this State, in 1780–1, 1788, 1789.

[4] John Hyatt was subsequently a Captain, in General John Morin Scott's Brigade.—(*Letter of Captain John Orbara to the Convention of the State of New York*, "FISHKILLS, 13th Janr, 1777.")

[5] John Drake was a son of Gilbert Drake, Chairman of the County Committee.

[6] Joseph Horton did not sign the *Association* until the day of the Election.

[7] Pierre Van Cortlandt was subsequently a member of the Second Provincial Congress, 1775–6, and Chairman of its Committee of Safety, January and February, 1776; a member of the Third Provincial Congress, 1776; of the Fourth Provincial Congress, 1776; of the Convention of the State of New York, 1776–7; of the First Council of Safety, 1777, of which he was the President; a Senator from the Southern District, 1777; President of the Convention of the State, 1777, Lieutenant-Governor of the State, 1777–1795; and died on the first of May, 1819, aged ninety-four years.

[8] Gilbert Drake was Chairman of the County Committee, in 1775–6; a member of the Second Provincial Congress, 1775–6; of the Third Provincial Congress, 1776; and of the Fourth Provincial Congress, 1776–7.

[9] Joseph Strang had held the command, under the Colonial Government, of the District commanded, under the reorganization, by Captain John Hyatt.

[10] Ebenezer Purdy was a member of the County Committee, from the Manor of Cortlandt, 1776–7; he represented Westchester County in the Assembly of the State, 1779–'80, 1782–'3, 1784, 1784–'5, 1787, 1791, 1792, 1795; he was one of the Senators from the Southern District, 1801–'6; and County Judge in 1797–'8.

[11] Isaac Norton was a member of the County Committee, from the Manor of Cortlandt, 1776–7.

[12] Stephen Sneden represented the Town of Eastchester, in the County Committee, 1776–7.

[13] Thomas Pinkney was promoted to the command of the Company, in March, 1776.

[14] Daniel Sebring represented the Town of Eastchester, in the County Committee, 1776–7.

[15] William Pinkney was promoted to the First Lieutenancy in March, 1776.

[16] *Historical Manuscripts relating to the War of the Revolution: Military Returns*, xxvii., 111.

[17] Joseph Drake was a member of the First and Second Provincial Congresses, by the former of whom he was made Colonel of the First Westchester-county Regiment, (*Historical Manuscripts*, etc.: *Military Returns* xxvi., 13.)

[18] A very interesting Affidavit, made by Lieutenant Willis, on the sixth of August, 1776, illustrative of the unpopularity of Colonel John Thomas, Junior, may be seen in the *Historical Manuscripts*, etc.: *Miscellaneous Papers*, xxxix., 347.

[19] Abraham Ledew represented the Manor of Philipsborough in the County Committee, in 1776–'7. This name was written, elsewhere, Le Doux.

[20] *Historical Manuscripts relating to the War of the Revolution: Military Returns*, xxvi., 140.

[21] Gabriel Requa lived about two miles back from Tarrytown; in 1777, he was a Lieutenant; and he was known, favorably, at that time, because of his capture of a Recruiting Officer from the City of New York. (*Proceedings of a General Court Martial*, "PEEKSKILL, April 18, 1777.")

[22] *Historical Manuscripts relating to the War of the Revolution: Military Returns*, xxvi, 140.

Captain; Israel Honeywell, for its First Lieutenant;[1] Dennis Lent, for its Second Lieutenant; and Hendrick Odell, for its Ensign.

The Beat or District of Yonkers made its election of Officers, agreeably to the provisions of the Congress's enactments; but the result was not satisfactory to Frederic Van Cortlandt and others, who had been rejected by the Company; and, through their influence in the Provincial Committee of Safety and Provincial Congress, the Commissions were withheld from the Officers-elect, and a new Election was ordered.[2] For some reason which has not been stated, although it can be very easily seen, that new Election was not held until the eighteenth of March, 1776, when John Warner, who had been elected Second Lieutenant in the former Election, was made the Captain; Jacob Post, who had been elected Ensign in the former Election, was made the First Lieutenant; Samuel Lawrence, the Second Lieutenant; and Israel Post, the Ensign of the Company.[3]

The Tarrytown Company originally elected Abraham Storm, for its Captain;[4] George Combs, for its First Lieutenant;[5] Joseph Appleby, for its Second Lieutenant; and Nathaniel Underhill, for its Ensign; but all of these, except Lieutenant Combs, having declined the honors and responsibilities of offices, a new Election was held, and Gload Requa[6] was chosen in the place of Captain-elect Storm; Cornelius Van Tassel was chosen Second Lieutenant, in the place of Lieutenant-elect Appleby; and Sibourt Acker was chosen Ensign, in the place of Ensign-elect Underhill.

The Associated Company in the upper part of Philipsborough elected William Dutcher, for its Captain;[7] Daniel Martlinghs, for its First Lieutenant;[8] Gershom Sherwood, for its Second Lieutenant;[9] and George Monson, for its Third Lieutenant.[10]

The six Companies on the Manor of Philipsborough, and those at Westchester, previously referred to, at Eastchester, and at New Rochelle and the Manor of Pelham, all of them reorganized and re-officered as thus described, were known as the South Battalion of Westchester-county, of which, soon afterwards, Joseph Drake was made Colonel,[11] James Hammond its Lieutenant-colonel,[12] Moses Drake its First Major,[13] Jonathan G. Graham its Second Major,[14] Abraham Emmons its Adjutant,[15] and Theophilus Barton, Junior, its Quarter-master.[16]

The District of Mamaroneck and Rye, except the upper end of King-street, elected Robert Bloomer for its Captain;[17] Alexander Hunt, for its First Lieutenant; Ezekial Halsted, for its Second Lieutenant; and Daniel Horton, for its Ensign.

The District in which were included Harrison's Precinct and the upper end of King-street, elected Henry Dusinberry, for its Captain; Lyon Miller, for its First Lieutenant;[18] Caleb Paulding Horton, for its Second Lieutenant; and Gilbert Dunsinberry, for its Ensign.[19] For some reason which is now unknown, a second Election for Officers of this Company was made on the tenth of January, 1776,[20] when John Thomas Minor was chosen for its Captain,[21] Gilbert Dusenberry, for

[1] Israel Honeywell was one of the Commissioners of Sequestration for Westchester County, 1777. He represented the Town of Westchester in the County Committee, 1776–'7; and he was also a Member of the Constitutional Convention of 1801, representing Westchester-county.

Israel Honeywell, Junior, was said to have been a member of the County Committee, representing the Manor of Philipsborough, 1776–'7; and, in 1777–'8 and 1778–'9, he was said to have represented Westchester-county in the Assembly of the State. It is not impossible that, in some instances, these references have become mixed.

[2] See pages 102, 103 ante.

[3] *Historical Manuscripts relating to the War of the Revolution: Military Returns*, xxvii., 142.

[4] Abraham Storm represented the Manor of Philipsborough in the County Committee, 1776–'7.

[5] George Combs was a member of the first County Committee, appointed in 1775; and in 1800, he represented Westchester-county, in the Assembly of the State.

[6] Gload Requa represented the Manor of Philipsborough in the County Committee, 1776–'7.

[7] William Dutcher was subsequently in command of a Company in the Secret Service of the Convention of the State, (*Historical Manuscripts*, etc.: *Miscellaneous Papers*, xxxv., 457.)

The village of Irvington, on the Hudson-river, was built on his farm; and his large house was standing in the middle of that village, within a few years, and, probably, stands there, now.

[8] Daniel Martling was subsequently a Lieutenant in Colonel Thomas's Regiment, by whom he was "recommended for the Standing Army," in 1777, although he was said to have been "illiteral," (*Historical Manuscripts*, etc.: *Military Committee's Papers*, xxv., 849.)

[9] Gershom Sherwood represented the Manor of Philipsborough in the County Committee, 1776–'7.

[10] George Morrison was the name of this officer, (*Historical Manuscripts*, etc.: *Miscellaneous Papers*, xxxv., 63.)

[11] Joseph Drake was elected to the command of the Company of New Rochelle and Pelham Manor, (*page* 105, *ante*;) but, as he was, also, a member of the Provincial Congress, he found means, within that body, to secure his appointment to the command of the Regiment, (*Historical Manuscripts*, etc.: *Military Returns*, xxvi., 13.)

[12] James Hammond represented the Manor of Philipsborough in the County Committee, 1776–'7. A very interesting paper concerning his conduct on the day when the enemy's ships came to anchor off Tarrytown, in July, 1776, and concerning his doings "as a buyer of Pork for "this State," may be seen in *Historical Manuscripts*, etc.: *Miscellaneous Papers*, xxxiv., 549.

[13] Probably an importation from Suffolk.

[14] We have found no other mention of this person.

[15] Abraham Emmons, of Yonkers, was one of those, in the Yonkers Company, who had voted for Frederic Van Cortlandt for its Captain, and who had united with that gentleman, who was the defeated candidate, in disregarding the Election and securing the degradation of John Cock, from the office to which he had been elected,—(*See pages* 102, 103, *ante*.)

[16] Thus printed in the records of the State; but it was probably intended for Theophilus Bartow, Junior, of New Rochelle.

[17] Robert Bloomer was a member of the first County Committee, appointed in May, 1775.

[18] Lyon Miller was reported as a Loyalist, soon after his election to the Lieutenancy of this Company, (*List of Westchester County Tories*, *Historical Manuscripts*, etc.: *Miscellaneous Papers*, xxxiv., 193;) and, very probably, that was one of the reasons for the holding of a new Election, by the Company.

[19] Gilbert Dusenberry was promoted to the First Lieutenancy of the Company, at the second Election for officers, in January, 1776.

[20] *Historical Manuscripts*, etc.: *Military Returns*, xxvii., 236.

[21] John Thomas, evidently a very young man, but one of the office-holding Thomas family. He was probably the second son of John Thomas, Junior, who was, at that time, a member of the Provincial Congress and, generally, a leader of the revolutionary party, and a continual office-holder.

This Captain John Thomas died January 6, 1835.—(Bolton's *History of Westchester-county*, original edition, i., 254; *the same*, second edition, ii., 761.)

its First Lieutenant; William Woodward, for its Second Lieutenant; and James Miller, Junior, for its Ensign.

The District which included the eastern portion of Northeastle elected Benoni Platt, for its Captain;[1] David Holby, for its First Lieutenant; Abraham Knapp, for its Second Lieutenant; and Jonathan Guion, for its Ensign.

The District which included the southern portion of Northeastle elected Benjamin Ogden, for its Captain; Jeremiah Hunter, for its First Lieutenant; Caleb Merritt, for its Second Lieutenant; and James Brundige, for its Ensign.

The District which included the northern portion of Northeastle was so entirely opposed to the Rebellion that "there were not persons sufficient in num-"bers who had signed the *Association* to make Offi-"cers of, so that nothing was done," in the form of an Election, during the Summer and Autumn of 1775; but an attempt was made to organize the Company, in the following January, when Joseph Green was found, to accept the command of the Company, and Henry Peers, to accept the First Lieutenancy; the Second Lieutenancy and the place of Ensign remaining vacant.[2]

The District which included Scarsdale, the White Plains, and Brown's Point elected Joshua Hatfield, for its Captain; James Verrian, for its First Lieutenant;[3] Anthony Miller, for its Second Lieutenant;[4] and John Falconer, for its Ensign; but, for some reason which is not now known, a new Election was made, which resulted in the election of Anthony Miller, for Captain; Nicholas Fisher, for First Lieutenant;[5] and John Crumton, for Second Lieutenant; Ensign Falconer appearing to have retained the Office to which he had been elected.[6]

The District which included the eastern portion of Bedford elected Lewis McDonald, for its Captain; James Miller, for its First Lieutenant;[7] Henry Lord, for its Second Lieutenant; and Jesse Miller, for its Ensign.

The District which included the western portion of Bedford elected Eli Seeley, for its Captain; Hezekiah Grey, for its First Lieutenant;[8] Ephraim Raymond, for its Second Lieutenant; and Gabriel Higgins, for its Ensign.

The District of Poundridge elected Joseph Lockwood, for its Captain; Noah Bouton, for its First Lieutenant; William Fausher, for its Second Lieutenant; and Gilbert Reynolds, for its Ensign.[9]

The District which included the southern portion of Salem elected Abijah Gilbert, for its Captain;[10] Jacob Hait, for its First Lieutenant; Sands Raymond, for its Second Lieutenant; and Joseph Coley, for its Ensign.

The District which included the northern portion of Salem elected Thaddeus Crane, for its Captain;[11] Jesse Truesdale, for its First Lieutenant; Ezekiel Hallcy, for its Second Lieutenant;[12] and Ebenezer Brown, for its Ensign. For some reason, the Captain-elect and the Ensign-elect "did not take their Com-"missions;" and on the eighteenth of December, 1775, a new Election resulted in the choice of Jesse Truesdale for Captain; Ezekiel Hawley, for First Lieutenant; Solomon Close, for Second Lieutenant; and Elijah Dean, for Ensign.[13]

The Companies at Scarsdale White Plains and Brown's Point, Bedford, Poundridge, Salem, Mamaroneck and Rye, Harrison's Precinct, and Northeastle, eleven in number, which were thus reorganized and re-officered, were known as the Middle Battalion of Westchester-county of which, soon afterwards, Thomas Thomas was made Colonel;[14] Gilbert

[1] Benoni Platt was a member of the first County Committee, appointed in May, 1775. The Hon. Lewis C. Platt, formerly Surrogate of the County, is his grandson.

[2] *Historical Manuscripts relating to the War of the Revolution: Military Returns*, xxvii., 231.

[3] James Varian was a member of the first County Committee, chosen in May, 1775.

[4] Anthony Miller was elected to the command of the Company, at the second Election, in December, 1775.

[5] Nicholas Fisher was a member of the County Committee, in February, 1776. (*Historical Manuscripts*, etc.: *Military Returns*, xxvii., 84.)

[6] *Letter from Robert Graham to the Provincial Congress*, "WHITE PLAINS, "December 21st, 1775." (*Historical Manuscripts*, etc.: *Military Returns*, xxvii., 246.)

[7] James Miller appears to have held offices, subsequently, in the New York Regiments, commanded by Colonels Ritzema, Gansevoort, and Van Cortlandt; but, inasmuch as there were several persons bearing that name—two, at the same time, in the same Regiment, bearing exactly opposite characters—it is not, now, known which, if either, was the patriotic Captain James Miller who is named in the text.

[8] Hezekiah Gray was chosen Captain of the Bedford Company of Minute-men, in February, 1776, (*Historical Manuscripts*, etc.: *Military Returns*, xxvii., 196;) a Report on the military status of which Company, may be seen in *Historical Manuscripts*, etc.: *Miscellaneous Papers*, xxxix., 325. He and his Company, although not regularly enlisted, were ordered to join the Continental Troops, at Peekskill (*Historical Manuscripts*, etc.: *Miscellaneous Papers*, xxxix., 325.)

[9] In April, 1777, Gilbert Reynolds was a member and "Clerk" of the local Committee of Cortlandt Manor, (*Proceedings of the Committee*, "CORTLENSMANNER, April 2d, 1777"—*Historical Manuscripts*, etc.: *Miscellaneous Papers*, xxxvii., 391.)

[10] Abijah Gilbert was a member of the County Committee, from Salem, 1776–'7; and he represented Westchester-county in the Assembly of the State, in 1779–'80, 1781–'2, 1782–'3, 1784, 1784–'5, 1786, 1788, 1791, 1800, 1800–'01, 1802, 1803, 1804, and 1804–'5.

[11] Thaddeus Crane was appointed Second Major of the Regiment; and he was succeeded by Lieutenant Truesdale, who was elected Captain, in the following December. He represented the County in the Assembly of the State, 1777–'8, 1778–'9, 1788–'9, and 1825; and in the Convention which ratified the *Constitution for the United States*.

[12] Ezekiel Hawley was Chairman of the Committee at Salem, in December, 1776 (*Historical Manuscripts*, etc.: *Miscellaneous Papers*, xxxv. 367).

[13] *Historical Manuscripts relating to the War of the Revolution: Military Returns*, xxvii., 245.

[14] Thomas Thomas was a son of Hon. John Thomas and a brother of John Thomas, Junior, who was a member of the Provincial Congress. He was a member of the first County Committee, appointed in May, 1775; and he represented Harrison's Precinct in the County Committee, 1776–'7. He was unpopular as a Military Officer; and several Officers refused to serve under him, in August, 1776, (*Historical Manuscripts*, etc.: *Miscellaneous Papers*, xxxix., 347.) He represented Westchester-county in the Assembly of the State, in 1780–'1, 1781–'2, 1782–'3, 1784, 1784–'5, 1786, 1787, 1788, 1792–'3, 1800–'1, 1802, 1803, 1804; he was Sheriff of the County, 1788–1792; he was a Senator from the Southern District, 1805–'6; in 1807, he was one of the Council of Appointment; and he died on the twenty-ninth of May, 1824.

Budd, its Lieutenant-colonel; Ebenezer Lockwood, its First Major;[1] Thaddeus Crane, its Second Major; Jonathan G. Tompkins, its Adjutant;[2] and John Thomas, Junior, its Quarter-master.[3]

The provisions of the Provincial Congress's enactment requiring one-fourth of the Militia of the County to be organized as Minute-men, appear to have been very indifferently obeyed; and the following are the Officers of the only Companies which were raised in Westchester-county, as far as they are now procurable from the records which have been preserved:

The Company of Poundridge and Lower Salem—which was called, also, "the First Company of Minute-men of the County"—elected, originally, Ebenezer Slason, to be its Captain; Henry Slason, to be its First Lieutenant; Ebenezer Scofield, to be its Second Lieutenant; and Daniel Waterberry, to be its Ensign; but, subsequently, when Captain Slason was promoted, Henry Slason was made Captain, Ebenezer Scofield was promoted to the First Lieutenancy, Daniel Waterberry to the Second Lieutenancy, and David Purdy was made its Ensign.[4]

The Company of Bedford elected Eli Seeley, to be its Captain;[5] Zephaniah Mills, to be its First Lieutenant; Cornelius Clarke, to be its Second Lieutenant; and Philip Leek, to be its Ensign; and their Commissions were issued by the Provincial Congress, on the twenty-seventh of October, 1775.[6]

Subsequently, "agreeable to the Demand made by "Colonl Drake to the Sub-Committee of Bedford," another Company of Minute-men was organized, in that Town, with Hezekiah Gray, for its Captain;[7] Cornelius Clark, for its First Lieutenant; James Miller for its Second Lieutenant;[8] and Isaac Titus, for its Ensign.[9]

A Company of nineteen men assembled at the White Plains and constituted themselves a Company of Minute-men, electing James Varian, to be their Captain;[10] Samuel Crawford, to be their First Lieutenant;[11] Isaac Oakley, to be their Second Lieutenant; and Joseph Todd, to be their Ensign.[12]

Besides these four Companies, such as they were, there does not appear to have been any Minute-men enlisted in the County—why should any have been

---

[1] Ebenezer Lockwood was a Justice of the Peace and one of the Quorum, under the Colonial Government; a member of the Second, Third, and Fourth Provincial Congresses; and of the Convention of the State of New York. He was a member of the Assembly of the State, representing Westchester-county, 1778–'9, 1784–'5, 1786, 1787, 1788; and he was County Judge, 1791–'3; and one of the Regents of the University, 1781–'7; etc. He died on the twenty-ninth of July, 1821, aged eighty-four years.

[2] Jonathan G. Tompkins was a member of the first County Committee, elected in May, 1775; a member of the Third and Fourth Provincial Congresses, of the Committee of Safety, and of the Council of Safety. He was a member of the Assembly of the State, 1780–'1, 1781–'2, 1786, 1787, 1788, 1791, 1792; of the Board of Regents of the University, 1787–1808; and of the Constitutional Convention of 1801. He was the First Judge of the County, 1793–'7, 1798–1802; and died on the twenty-second of May, 1823.

The distinguished Daniel D. Tompkins, Governor of the State, Vice President of the United States, and one of the greatest men of his period, was a son of Jonathan G. Tompkins.

[3] John Thomas, Junior, as the reader knows, was one of the leading men of his party, in Westchester-county; a member of its County Committee and of the Provincial Congress; and a brother of the Colonel of the Regiment. Although it is said, positively, that he was also the Quarter-master of this Regiment, it appears incredible that he was the person, and can be accounted for only by the profits which attended such an office and the well known proclivities of that family, in that direction, wherever an opportunity was presented. We prefer to believe that this Quarter-master's place was given to that "John Thomas Minor," the second son of John Thomas, Junior, who had been already elected to the command of the Company in Harrison's Precinct, at a second Election, after Henry Disenberry had been elected and accepted the Office, a few weeks previously.

With the exception of the two Companies in the Borough Town of Westchester and at Yonkers, the elections of whose Officers were separately reported, the list of Officers who were *originally* elected by the several Companies, as stated in the text, have been taken, generally without any change in the spelling of the proper names, even when known to have been erroneous, from the *Historical Manuscripts*, etc.: *Military Returns*, xxvi., 122–125. In the instances of Yonkers, Eastchester, Tarrytown, Harrison, Scarsdale and the White Plains, Salem, etc., where *new* Elections were held, the statements of those new Elections have been taken from the several Returns of those new Elections, referred to, at the foot of each, respectively.

[4] *Letter from Samuel Drake and Lewis Graham to the Provincial Congress*, "1st March, 1776;" *Journal of the Provincial Congress*, "4 ho., P.M., "March 1, 1876."

In the *Journals of the Provincial Congress: Correspondence*, ii., 90, Ebenezer Scofield is called "Ebenezer Scofield, Junior;" and the Commissions of the original Officers are said to have been issued on the twenty-seventh of October, 1775.

[5] Eli Seeley was originally elected to the command of the Company in the western part of the Town of Bedford, (*Page* 107, *ante*.)

[6] *Journals of the Provincial Congress: Correspondence*, ii., 90.

[7] Hezekiah Gray was originally the First Lieutenant in the Company in the western part of the Town of Bedford, of which Eli Seeley was the Captain, (*Page* 107, *ante*.)

[8] James Miller was originally the First Lieutenant in the Company in the eastern part of the Town of Bedford, of which Lewis McDonald, Junior, was the Captain, (*Page* 107, *ante*.)

[9] Isaac Titus had served in Captain Mills's Company, under Colonel Holmes, in the Campaign of 1775, (*Page* 101, *ante*.)

The authority for the statement concerning the second Company may be seen in a *Letter from the Sub-committee at Bedford to the Chairman of the County Committee*, "Bedford 15 February 1776,"—(*Historical Manuscripts*, etc.: *Military Returns*, xxvii., 196.)

See, also, *Journal of the Provincial Congress*, "Die Martis, 3 ho., P.M. "Feb. 20th, 1776," where the Secretary erroneously recorded the Sub-Committee and the Company as of Harrison's Precinct instead as of Bedford.

[10] Captain James Varian was a member of the first County Committee, appointed in May, 1775, (*Page* 83, *ante*;) and First Lieutenant of the Scarsdale, White Plains, and Brown's Point Company of Militia, of which Joshua Hatfield was the Captain, (*Page* 107, *ante*.)

[11] Lieutenant Samuel Crawford was a member of the first County Committee, appointed in May, 1775, (*Page* 83, *ante*;) and the only representative of the Manor of Scarsdale, in the County Committee, 1776–'7.

[12] The authority for this statement is a *Letter from Jonathan G. Tompkins and Nicolas Fisher to the Provincial Congress*," White Plains, February 14th, 1776"—(*Historical Manuscripts*, etc.: *Military Returns*, xxvii., 84.)

From the same manuscript, the following list of the names of the nineteen who thus organized themselves into a Company of Minute-men, has been carefully copied, without changing the spelling of the names:

"Benjamin Lyon,	Joseph Todd,
"Oliver Killick,	John Drake,
"John Beeks,	Ezekiel Doten,
"Stephen Shelley,	James Farrel,
"Philip Hoestis,	Andrew Fach,
"Micah Townsend, Esq.,	James Brundage,
"James Verryan,	Gilbert Horton,
"Samuel Crawford,	David Johnston,
"Isaac Oakley,	Robert Graham

"William Tompson."

spected from a community in which the revolutionary party had scarcely "a Corporal's Guard," except of those who were office-holders or office-seekers?—but as soon as *two* Companies had been organized, the County Committee "took the liberty, with all "submission, to recommend Samuel Drake, to be "Colonel,[1] Lewis Graham, to be Lieutenant-Colonel;[2] "Abraham Storm, to be First Major;[3] Samuel Lyon, "of Northeastle, to be Second Major; Elijah Miller, to "be Adjutant;[4] and Josiah Mills, to be Quarter-mas-"ter[5];" and thus the re-organization of the Militia of Westchester-county and the organization of her fighting population were completed.

There was one feature in the Provincial Congress's enactment for the reorganization of the Militia which was oppressive on the great body of the working classes, who were unable to bear the burden it imposed; and it was made the subject of serious complaint to those of the well-born whom, in many instances, they had, unwittingly, placed in authority—revolutionary authority—over themselves. Reference is made to the requirement that every one, between the ages of sixteen and fifty years, should furnish himself with a good musket and bayonet, a sword or tomahawk, a cartridge-box and belts, twenty-three rounds of cartridges, twelve flints, and a knapsack; in addition to which he was to keep, in reserve, a pound of gunpowder and three pounds of bullets, of proper size for his musket. These he was required to have and to keep, continually; and he was required, also, to parade, for drill, on the first Monday of each month. Heavy penalties were imposed on those who should fail to discharge all these requirements; with levies on the properties of the delinquents, if they possessed property, or, in the absence of property, they were to be imprisoned "until such fine, together "with the charges, should be paid," which meant, at that time, an imprisonment in a cold Jail, without any other food than that which the prisoners' friends or the charitable could provide; without the slightest opportunity to earn anything, from which to support themselves or pay the fines; and the starvation of those who were dependent on the unfortunate victims.[6]

While these provisions of that enactment were peculiarly oppressive on that class of poverty-stricken working-men and boys, in the Cities, then largely unemployed, who had been the ever-ready, ever-noisy, and ever-destructive auxiliaries of the revolutionary faction, in all the riotous demonstrations of the preceding ten years, and while these enactments, therefore, in those instances, appeared to be somewhat retributive in their character and operations, they were, also, very oppressive on many a farmer in Westchester-county, who had been more peaceful in his inclinations and conduct than those working-men, in the Cities, had been. Indeed, the required equipment, in specified form, of themselves, and their boys, and their hired help—their well-tried fowling-pieces having been unavailable for that purpose—and the stated withdrawal of all of them from their farms, for drill, on frequent, specified days, no matter how necessary their presence, at home, might have been, were unduly burdensome on all those farmers, to say nothing of the opportunity which was thereby afforded, very soon afterwards, for still greater acts of lawless oppression, in the seizure of those very equipments,

[1] Samuel Drake was a member of the Provincial Convention, 1775; a member of the first County Committee, 1775; and of that of 1776–'7. He represented Westchester-county in the Assembly of the State, 1777–'8, 1779–'80, 1780–'81, 1786 and 1788; etc. He was a resident of the Manor of Cortlandt.

[2] Lewis Graham was connected with the Morrises, of Morrisania, by marriage; and he was a member of all the Provincial Congresses and of the Convention of the State, 1775–'78. He was made Judge of the Court of Admiralty, in February, 1778.

[3] Abraham Storm had been originally elected to the command of the Tarrytown Company of Militia, (*Page* 106, *ante*;) and he represented the Manor of Philipsborough in the County Committee of 1776–'7. He lived at Tarrytown.

[4] Elijah Miller was a resident and one of the Sub-committee of Northeastle.

[5] This statement is made on the authority of a *Letter from Gilbert Drake, Chairman of the County Committee, to the Provincial Congress*, "WHITE PLAINS, October 24th, 1775." The *Journal of the Provincial Congress*, ("Die Mercurii, 10 ho., A.M., October, 1775,") shows the receipt of the letter, by that body, and the issue of the Commissions to the several gentlemen named.

[6] As an illustration of the effect of the Rebellion on the great body of the lowly working-men, in this particular feature, as early as in the Autumn of 1775, and as an evidence of the uneasiness of those working-men, because of this oppressive enactment, the following homely Petition has been copied from the original manuscript, in the *Historical Manuscripts*, etc.: *Petitions*, xxxi., 52:

"NEW YORK, Sept. ye 9, 1775.

"TO THE GENTLEMEN OF THE CONGRESS IN NEW YORK.

"We your humble Pertisners Gentlemen are now warned To bear "arms In Defence of our Country truly It is the Native place of some of "us wich Now Gentlemen may it please your onners To take it in Con-"sideration we are Controld more by poverty than By our own will we "must Now beg of your honners To take it in Consideration were you "in our State of Poverty you wold not lay on us more than we can "Bare Some of this poor Cyty Now who you have you have Command. "To bare Arms In Defence of ours Liberty and Rites Not our Rite but "such gentlemen as has got lands and Estates But some of us Now has "Skarsely got Victuals from one Day to another Neyther fire Nor Can-"dles our Wifes and poor Children Suffering for Bread and your honners "have pleased To lay on us or some of us such things as we Cant supply "ourselves with gun Faguet Belts Cartridge Box Powder and Ball as "for Powder It must Please your honners some of you To open a Store "of it for I have Tryd in this City To get a Small Quantity but Could "Not and our Officers says It will be a fine to neglect having any of "them so therefore we your humble pertisoners Earnestly Beg That It "may Please your honners To lend us such thing as you have laid out "for us poor And Destressed men to get Gentlemen we beg It may be "taken in no ofence we are willing to beare with with any thing It "may please you to put on us if In our power some cant without Run-"ning in Deat for For them the Next go to gail for it will any one pay "The Det Consider it would Now for you to loose All your time wich "you sit Now making laws for us as one of us or some of us to by a gun "Consider our poverty and assist the poor or make some of those with "Ruffles Turn out as well as we or supply us with acutrements I Im-"magine some of those Rich wich have lands and thousands In Estates "will not got find if neglect appearing we Beg you will think of us as "you are our hed and parliament who Ever gets This is Desired to "Covay it to the Congress In New York.

"September 9, 1775."

With this menacing paper before one, it is not difficult to make one's self believe that the "poor reptiles" had really some thoughts of "biting," as Governeur Morris had foreseen a few months previously.

sometimes with warrants of "impressment," nominally for the equipment of Regiments, in garrison or elsewhere; sometimes with arbitrary orders for seizing them, on *ex parte* assumptions of the disaffection to the Rebellion, of those who owned them; and sometimes, not unfrequently, by inroads of organized bodies of thieves, from Connecticut or elsewhere, who, without even a shadow of legal or local authority and only on the shallow pretext of superior "patriotism," overpowered the isolated and peaceful farmers, and retired with well-supplied stocks of lawlessly acquired plunder.

The Provincial Congress, like similar Congresses in other Colonies, and as was foretold of this, by those who had opposed the creation of it, was not long in existence and in possession of its usurped authority, when, as has been already stated, it commenced to arrest those, strangers and residents, who ventured to differ from it and to speak and to act in accordance with existing Laws and with their own convictions of duty;[1] and it did not hesitate to throw into prison[2] or to send into exile,[3] those whom it had arrested. It waited for no verified complaint: it made no pretence that a breach of any written Law or of any other enactment was necessary, to warrant an arrest: it received secret, *ex parte* "information" as all which was needed to authorize the arrest, the confinement, and the infliction of punishment on its victims, not unfrequently without a hearing or an examination: and it held those who were accused, and tried them in secret Sessions, and passed judgments on them, not unfrequently without permitting them to confront their accusers or to see and read the papers on which they had been arrested, and held, and tried—in one notable instance, the accused was not permitted to *see* the fifteen affidavits, which had been trumped up against him, *after* he had been arrested and thrown into a jail, nor to know their contents nor the nature of the accusation, until he was brought out for trial when they were only *read* to him; and copies of those affidavits were withheld from him, by a formal vote of the Congress, when they were asked for and when the cost of copying them was tendered, only because the publication of those several papers would have exposed the fifteen partisan tools and the eminently genteel hand who had guided them in a shameless and unfounded persecution of an innocent man, to the contempt of the country and of the world.[4] It sat in secret judgment over those whom it had arrested, in instances wherein it was, also, the only accuser;[5] and it recognized the existence, in merely local self-constituted "Committees," in the several Counties, of the same authority to arrest and to imprison those who were obnoxious to them, either with or without accusers or accusations, which it claimed for itself and exercised.[6] In short, it very promptly set aside the government of the written Law, and established, in its stead, that of the unrestrained will of an oligarchy, seated within every Town, against which there was no other security, for either persons or properties, than the personal favor of the stronger local power, no matter how obtained—all that, too, was done in the name of Freedom and the Rights of Man, by those who assumed to be honorable men, and, most of all, by those who insisted that their allegiance to their Prince and their attachment to "the illustrious House "of Hanover" were ranked, by themselves, as among their most singular blessings;[7] by those, indeed, who, nearly at the same time, declared they were "deeply "impressed with the importance, the utility, and the "necessity of an accommodation with their Parent "State;" and who were, also, they said, "conscious "that the best service we can render to the present "and all future generations must consist in promoting "it."[8]

---

[1] See, in the *Journals* and *Correspondence of the Congress* and in the *Historical Manuscripts relating to the War of the Revolution*, preserved in the office of the Secretary of State, at Albany, the records and papers in the several cases, among others, of Angus McDonald, Captain Patrick Sinclair, Captain Johan Christian Drewitz, John Morrell, Adam Patrick, Isaiah Purdy, Captain Melancton Lawrence, Joseph Allicock, Captain Charles De Kay, and John Candell. A simple reference to the several papers, in detail, would require more room than can be given to it, in this place.

[2] The instances of Angus McDonald, Captain Drewitz, John Morrell, Adam Patrick, and Isaiah Purdy, already referred to, among others.

[3] Angus McDonald was sent to General Wooster, then in command of a body of Connecticut troops; and, by him, he was sent to Fairfield, and imprisoned, with aggravated severity, of which even his jailer complained.

[4] Reference is here made to the case of Timothy Doughty, of Dutchess-county, in which the victim, because he declined to sign the *General Association*—there was no evidence which the Congress considered respectable, showing any other offence—was seized by Egbert Benson, whose methods at an Election have been noticed; and sent to New York, without *any* evidence of wrong-doing; and thrown into a jail, without any provision for his support. At the request of Benson, he was kept in jail, for several weeks, without knowing for what he had been arrested; and that, only to enable his *unseen* and *malignant* accuser to manufacture evidence against him. Fifteen *worthless* affidavits were subsequently sent to the Congress, *and* READ *to the victim, when he was given a hearing;* but their worthlessness was so evident that the Congress discharged Doughty, although, as stated, it would not permit him to have copies of the papers, nor even to read them, (*Journals of the Committee of Safety*, September 4th; *the same*, September 28th, 1775: *Journals of the Provincial Congress*, "Die Jovis, 9 ho., A.M., October 19, 1775;" *the same*, "Die Martis, 9 ho., A.M., October 24, 1775;" *Petitions of Timothy Doughty and others*, September 22, 25, October 4, 11, 1775, (*Historical Manuscripts*, etc.: *Petitions*, XXXI., 96, 88, 91, 95.)

[5] Among other instances, those of Angus McDonald, Melancton Lawrence, and Captain Drewitz, may be referred to.

[6] The local authorities arrested and confined, without any trustworthy evidence, John Morrell, Adam Patrick, and Isaiah Purdy, in Orange-county; the Berghs, Timothy Doughty, and Mordecai Lester, in Dutchess county; John Connor, in Tryon-county; Abraham Lawrence, in Queens county; etc.

[7] *Letter from the Provincial Congress to the Gentlemen Merchants of the Province of Quebec*, "*In Provincial Congress*, New-York, June 12th, 1775."

[8] *Letter from the Provincial Congress to the Delegates for the Colony of New York, in the Continental Congress*, "IN PROVINCIAL CONGRESS, NEW-"YORK, June 28th, 1775."

See, also, the *Plan of Accommodation*, adopted in advance and kept in constant readiness for *immediate* use, by the same Provincial Congress, "4 ho., P.M., Die Martis, June 27th, 1775," (*see pages 97, 98, ante*;) *Letter from the Provincial Congress to the Committee of Richmond county*, "NEW-"YORK, 2d December, 1775;" etc.

In the earlier days of its existence, the Provincial Congress made those arbitrary arrests without any enactment, its own or that of any other body, which could have afforded even a shadow of even revolutionary law, if the enactments of a body in acknowledged rebellion may be regarded as Laws, for such a radical violation of what were said to have been, and of what were, the fundamental principles of the Duties of those in authority and of the Rights of Person and of Property which belonged to those who were governed; but there appear to have been some, among the supporters of the Rebellion, who continued to have doubts concerning the unauthorized and unrestrained right of arrest, even where an opposition to the measures of the Rebellion was openly and unreservedly expressed.

On the eleventh of August, a letter was received by the Provincial Congress, from the local Committee at Brookhaven, on Long Island, stating that certain persons, named therein, were "counteracting every "measure recommended for redress and grievances,[1] "and opposing the measures of Congresses and Com-"mittees; and that they declared they would furnish, "and that it is suspected they have furnished, the "men-of-war and cutters with provisions,"[2] in the same manner that the *Asia* and other men-of-war were supplied, with the approval of the Provincial Congress, at that time and subsequently, by those who were more in favor with that body; and, at the same time, "requesting the Congress to direct such "measures as they shall think proper, to suppress "such conduct." That letter was referred to a Committee of which Benjamin Kissam, of the City of New York, was Chairman.[3] A Report from that Committee was laid before the Congress, on the twenty-sixth of August;[4] and, after consideration of the subject, and apparently without dissent, the following enactment was made on the general subject of the Brookhaven Committee's inquiry:

"WHEREAS attempts may be made to promote dis-"cord among the Inhabitants of this Colony, and to "assist and aid the Ministerial Army and Navy, in "their endeavours to carry into execution the cruel and "oppressive Acts of Parliament, against the Rights "and Liberties of the Inhabitants of this Continent:

"And as the immutable laws of self-defence and "preservation justify every reasonable measure en-"tered into, to counteract or frustrate such attempts: "Therefore,

"RESOLVED, That if any person or persons shall be "found guilty, before the Committee of any City "or County, of attempting, (after the date of this "Resolution,) to furnish the Ministerial Army or "Navy with Provisions or other necessaries, contrary "to the Resolutions of the Continental or of this "Congress;[5] or of holding a correspondence, by letter "or otherwise, for the purpose of giving information "to the said Army or Navy, of the measures pursued "by the United Colonies or any of them;[6] or of ad-"vising expedients which the said Army or Navy "might or ought to pursue, against the said Colonies

[1] Thus printed in the official copy of the *Journal of the Provincial Congress.*

[2] Those who shall desire to learn more of that Brookhaven matter may be gratified by a perusal of Gaine's *New-York Gazette and Mercury*, No. 1217, NEW-YORK, Monday, February 6, 1775; of a *Letter from Major Benjamin Floyd and others to James Rivington*, "BROOK-HAVEN, SUF-"FOLK-COUNTY, NEW-YORK, March 6, 1775," (*Rivington's New-York Gazetteer*, No. 103, NEW-YORK, Thursday, April 6, 1775;) and of a *Declaration of the Inhabitants of Brook-haven, Suffolk-county, New York*, "BROOK-"HAVEN, March 10, 1775," (Gaine's *New-York Gazette: and the Weekly Mercury*, No. 1223, NEW-YORK, Monday, March 20, 1775.)

[3] *Journal of the Provincial Congress*, "Die Veneris, 9 ho. A.M., August "11th, 1775."

[4] *Journal of the Provincial Congress*, "Die Sabbati, 9 ho. A.M., August "26th, 1775."

[5] The Provincial Congress not only had passed no Resolutions prohibiting the supply of "the Ministerial Army and Navy with provisions or other "necessaries," thereby, even from the revolutionary standpoint, leaving that business open to whomsoever might embark in it; but, on the morning of the day on which this enactment was made, it gave its official sanction to the supply of the *Asia*, man-of-war, with its necessary supplies, from the City of New York, and with water and beer, from Brooklyn, all of them by Abraham Lott, the official "Agent-victualler "for His Majesty's Ships in this Port," (*Journal of the Provincial Congress*, "Die Veneris, 9 ho., A.M., September 1st, 1775.") Four days afterwards, Doctor McLean was authorized to supply the same ship, with Drugs and Medicines, as he had previously done, (*Journal of the Committee of Safety*, "Die Martis, 9 ho., A.M., September 5th, 1775.") On the twenty-ninth of January, 1776, William Allen had permission to go on board the *Asia*, to measure the men for shoes, and to make and deliver a hundred pairs, if so many should be needed. (*Journal of the Committee of Safety*, "Die Lunæ, 10 ho., A.M., January 29th, 1776.") On the sixteenth of February, 1776, Henry White was permitted to supply the *Asia* and the *Phœnix* with fresh provisions and vegetables. (*Journal of the Provincial Congress*, "Die Veneris, 10 ho., A.M., February 16th, 1776.")

While the Provincial Congress was thus monopolizing the supplying of the men-of-war, it "was filled with the utmost anxiety" when, during the Autumn of 1775, "small boats from Queens and Westchester-coun-"ties" undertook to enter into the same business; and "to prevent so "great a mischief," a small armed vessel was purchased, "to watch those "and other dangerous supplies of the like kind,"—(*The Committee of Safety to the New-York Delegates in Continental Congress*, "IN COMMITTEE OF "SAFETY, NEW-YORK, January 22, 1776.") On the seventh of February, 1776, when the Chairman of the Committee of the City asked permission for an *nominal* applicant to send on board the *Asia*, two hogsheads of Spirits, two dozens of Coffee, and one dozen of Chocolate, the solicited permission was withheld until the name of the applicant could be ascertained, which does not appear to have been accomplished, (*Letter from Henry Remsen, Chairman of the Committee of the City, to the Committee of Safety*, and the reply of the latter, both undated: *Journal of the Committee of Safety*: "Die Mercurii, 10 ho., A.M., Feb'y 7th, 1776.")

There does not seem to have been any hesitation in supplying the provisions, on the part of any one, either in New York, or in Westchester-county, or in Queens-county—why should there have been? The only question appears to have been, *by whom* and *for whose* pecuniary benefit they should be thus supplied. There were those, in the Provincial Congress, who were always ready to enjoy an advantage, in trade or elsewhere: there was a commercial advantage, in victualing the ships, which those "patriots" preferred to retain. Had the boatmen of Westchester and Queens counties, while bringing their surplus products to market, been wise enough to have consigned their cargoes to some of those enterprising "Merchants," Alexander McDougal and his armed vessel, watching "those dangerous supplies," would not have been necessary.

Verily, patriotism and pelf were closely connected, in those times.

[6] James Duane, the friend and correspondent of Lieutenant-governor Colden, was, at that time, one of the Delegates from New York, in the Congress of the Colonies; and Egbert Dumond, the friend and correspondent of the Royal Governor, William Tryon, represented Ulster-county, in that Provincial Congress, and was probably present—he was in New York—when this enactment was considered and adopted.

"or any of them,[1] such person or persons, so found "guilty, shall be punished at the discretion of the "Committee before whom he or they shall be so found "guilty, or at the discretion of the Congress or Com-"mittee of Safety of this Colony, so as the punish-"ment, by them, at their discretion inflicted, shall "not exceed three months imprisonment or other the "punishments hereinafter mentioned, for the first "offence.

"RESOLVED, That if any person or persons shall "be found guilty, before the Committee of any City or "County in this Colony, of having furnished the "Ministerial Army or Navy (after the date of this "Resolution,) with Provisions or other necessaries, "contrary to any Resolution of the Continental or of "this Congress, such person or persons, so found "guilty thereof, upon due proof thereof, shall be "disarmed and forfeit double the value of the Pro-"visions or other necessaries so furnished, to be ap-"plied to the public exigencies of this Colony, in "such manner as the Congress or Committee of Safety "of this Colony, for the time being, shall order and "direct. And that such person or persons, so found "guilty, shall be put into and detained in close con-"finement, at his or their own expense and charge, "until three months after he or they, respectively, "shall have paid such forfeiture. And that every "such person or persons, who shall be found guilty "of a second offence of the same kind, shall be ban-"ished from this Colony, for the term of seven years "from the time of such second conviction.

"Although this Congress have a tender regard to "the freedom of Speech, the rights of Conscience, "and personal Liberty, as far as an indulgence in "these particulars may be consistent with our gen-"eral security; yet, for the public safety, be it

"RESOLVED, That if any person or persons shall, "hereafter, oppose or deny the authority of the Con-"tinental or of this Congress, or the Committee of "Safety, or the Committees of the respective "Counties, Cities, Towns, Manors, Precincts, or Dis-"tricts in this Colony, or dissuade any person or "persons from obeying the recommendations of the "Continental or this Congress, or the Committee of "Safety, or the Committees aforesaid, and be thereof "convicted before the Committee of the County or "any thirteen or more of their number, who shall or "may meet upon a general call of the Chairman of "such Committee where such person or persons may "reside, that such Committee shall cause such of "fenders to be disarmed;[2] and for the second offence-"they shall be committed to close confinement, at "their respective expense.[3] And, in case any of the "said Committees are unable to carry this or any "Resolution into execution, they are hereby directed "to apply to the next County Committee or command-"ing Officer of the Militia, or to the Congress or the "Committee of Safety of this Colony, for necessary "assistance, as the case may require.[4] But if it "shall so happen that any violators of this Resolu-"tion shall reside in a County where there is no "Committee of the County, in that case, the matter "shall be triable before the Committee of the next "County: PROVIDED that no person shall be tried "before the General Committee of the City and "County of New York, upon the Resolutions herein "contained, unless the stated quorum be present; "and in the City and County of Albany, unless "there are present twenty-five members.

"RESOLVED FARTHER, That the respective Com-"mittees and the Militia of the several Counties, by "order of the respective Committees or of the Com-"missioned Officer of the Militia then nearest, are "hereby expressly enjoined to apprehend every "Inhabitant or Resident of this Colony, who now is "or who shall hereafter be discovered to be enlisted "or in arms against the Liberties of America, and to "confine such offender or offenders, in safe custody; "and his or their punishment is reserved to the "determination of this or some future Provincial "Congress. And the Committee nearest to any per-"son who shall be so enlisted or have taken up "arms against the Liberties of America are hereby "directed to appoint some discreet person to take "the charge of the Estate, both real and personal, of "any such person or persons; which person so ap-"pointed shall be invested with such Estate, and "render, on oath, a just and true account thereof, to "this or some future Congress or to Commissioners "by them to be appointed, and to pay the issues and "profits thereof to the Treasurer appointed by this "Congress, for the use of the associated Colonies.

"RESOLVED, That if any person be taken up on "suspicion of any of the Crimes in the above Reso-"lutions specified, he shall immediately be taken "before the Committee of the City, Town, Manor,

[1] Charles Lee, the second in command in the Continental Army, had not, then, laid his well-devised "*Plot*" before General Howe; General Samuel H. Parsons had not yet commenced the supply of information, concerning projected military movements, etc., through "Squire "Heron," to Sir Henry Clinton; Israel Putnam had not yet led Robert R. Livingston to "question" "his very fidelity;" and Benedict Arnold, maddened by wrongs imposed on him, had not yet commenced his correspondence with John André.

[2] Compare this particular penalty with the particular requirement, contained in the enactment concerning the Militia, adopted eleven days previously, (*page* 102 *ante*,) that *every Inhabitant*, between sixteen and fifty years of age, should fully equip himself with arms and largely supply himself with ammunition, heavy penalties being imposed, in case of default, in either respect.

[3] That particular feature of this enactment was intended to impoverish the victim, if he possessed property, or to leave him to be starved, if he had none; and the barbarism of the provision and of those who framed it, was seen, subsequently, in the physical sufferings of John O'Connor and David Purdy; and in those of the Berghs, the Dobbses, and Timothy Doughty, (*Historical Manuscripts*, etc.: *Petitions*, xxxi., 98, 96, 88, 70, 76; etc.)

[4] Not long after this enactment was made, the Committee of Westchester-county, as will be seen, hereafter, called for and received the armed assistance of men of Connecticut, to enforce obedience to its Resolutions or submission to some of its arbitrary seizures of the properties of some of their law-abiding neighbors.

"Precinct, or District where the offender shall have "been taken up; and if, upon examination, the sus-"picion shall appear to the said Committee to be "groundless, that he be discharged: PROVIDED, "ALSO, that no person charged to be an offender "shall be tried upon any of the foregoing Resolves, "until the persons to be Judges of the offence be "first severally sworn to try and adjudge the person "so charged, without partiality, favour, or affection, "or hope of reward, according to evidence; and that "every witness who shall be examined on such trial "shall have the charge distinctly and clearly stated "to him; and be thereupon sworn to speak the truth, "the whole truth, and nothing but the truth."[1]

* * * * * * *

It will be seen that, by this remarkable enactment, every person in the Colony was placed at the mercy of the local Committee of the County in which he lived; that no one was permitted to disregard or to treat with disrespect either the "recommendations" or the "Resolutions" of Congresses or Committees, of either high or low degree, no matter with what disclaimers of obligation those "recommendations" and "Resolutions" might have been accompanied,[2] nor to dissent from whatever outrages on persons or properties there might be inflicted on quiet, law-abiding persons, by even the most insignificant "District Committee" in the Colony, nor even to question the authority to do whatever it should incline to do, no matter how monstrous its actions should be, in any such Congress or Committee; that sequestration, if not confiscation and absolute sale,[3] of properties, real and personal, and close confinement in barracks or jails, and banishment from home and family, no matter at what cost to him or to those who were dependent on him, were penalties to which every one was subject, whenever a County Committee saw fit to inflict them; that, by making the offences and the penalties matters of general interest to "the associa-"ted Colonies"—for doing which no one can pretend that a local Provincial Congress, even during a Rebellion, could consistently assume to legislate—this enactment afforded a warrant for inroads from other Colonies, whenever the latter were inclined to make them, for the direct adjustment of matters in which they possessed a conceded interest; that no appeal from the judgment of such a local revolutionary tribunal, too often controlled by personal or family quarrels[4] or by ecclesiastical or neighborhood feuds or by foreign interferences, was provided for or allowed; and that the dictates of his conscience and the oath of his office, if he held an office, as far as these should assert his duty to his Sovereign and to the Colonial and Home Governments, must be sternly disregarded and suppressed, by every one.

History has failed to record, in the annals of any other community, another such instance of solemn mockery and of refined hypocrisy and of relentless personal and partisan bitterness as is seen in this enactment, framed and ordained and promulgated by men who pretended to so much of honor and intelligence, to so much of loyalty to the King and of regard for the Constitution, to so much of veneration for the Rights of Man and of reverence for the supreme Laws of God, as were claimed, for themselves, by the Livingstons and the Morrises, the Van Cortlandts and the Clintons, and their several supporters, in the Provincial Congress of Colonial New York; and the annals of partisan malignity, ecclesiastical or civil, afford few instances wherein an ecclesiastical or civil enactment, no matter by what authority nor under what circumstances it may have been ordained and promulgated, has been more relentlessly enforced, in its penalties, than this enactment of a revolutionary Congress was enforced, in the Colony and State of New York. Scarcely a homestead existed in Colonial Westchester-county, in which the unbridled despotism of a self-constituted Precinct or District or Town Committee did not display its ill-gotten, ill-regulated power, under the sanction of this enactment, protected and supported, whenever protection and support were needed to ensure entire success, by the local and the Continental military power or by hungry ruffians from over the border;[5] and there are enough of

[1] *Journal of the Provincial Congress*, "4 ho., P.M., September 1st, "1775."

[2] Compare the disclaimers which accompanied the *Associations* which were sent out, for signatures, (*pages* 94, 95, *ante*;) with the penalties which were subsequently imposed on those who had declined to sign those *Associations*, in the orders issued for their disarmament, (*page* 112, *ante*;) in this remarkable enactment; and with the multitude of arbitrary arrests and painful imprisonments, throughout the Colony, with which the pages of the records of the doings of the revolutionary faction so peculiarly abound.

[3] We are sensible that the *letter* of this enactment affords a warrant for nothing else than a sequestration of the properties of those who were proscribed; but the *spirit* of it was seen in the action of those Committees who were, by this enactment, made masters of the great body of the Colonists, when those Committees, as will be seen, hereafter, not only sequestrated, but confiscated and sold, the properties of those who were personally obnoxious to them.

[4] "The information you have received, in respect to Captain Cuthbert, "is, I believe, in part true, but has originated from a private pique, and "is much exaggerated. You will observe I have bought his wheat from "him, which he readily sold me, at the same time complained, most "bitterly, of being threatened with the loss of his life, by the same Don "you mentioned, who, I believe, is a very bad man. Many persons in "the country are seeking for private revenge under pretence of concern "for the publick safety."—*General* (*Benedict Arnold to Samuel Chase*, "SOREL, May 15, 1776.")

General Arnold's remarks were perfectly applicable to every portion of the Colony. Who, among historical students, does not know that one of the most virulent of those who persecuted the loyal and law abiding Colonists, in Colonial New York—a very thinly disguised monarchist who was thus figuring as a most zealous republican—had been largely prompted to play a part in the politics of the period which was radically distasteful to himself, in order that he might, thereby, revengefully oppose and persecute the friends and family of the two young ladies, sisters, who had successively preferred more graceful and more companionable, if not as mentally and scholastically deserving, suitors for their hands and fortunes?

[5] This sentence has been written with a perfect understanding of what is stated in the text, concerning those who passed from Connecticut into Westchester-county, to assist the local Committees, in that County, in their work of outrage and robbery. Greenwich, Stamford, Ridgefield, Danbury, Wilton, New Canaan, and the other border Towns

merely incidental allusions, left among the well-concealed records of those times, to say nothing of those more startling evidences which went, unrecorded, into the graves of those who had been thus plundered and outraged, when the latter were carried to their last earthly homes, to show that the Drakes and the Thomases, the Odells and the Martlings, the Lockwoods and the Dutchers, and those who were associated with them, "patriotically" supporting what was called "the glorious cause of Liberty," were experts in ruthless barbarism, and entirely worthy of the crowns of infamy which history has awarded to more distinguished, but not more accomplished, inquisitors and despots.

The publication of this barbarous enactment was followed, immediately, by active preparations for persecution, by those, in Westchester-county, who were engaged in promoting the cause of the Rebellion; and they promptly reported to the Provincial Congress, for what purpose is very evident, the following list of those, in that County, who were especially obnoxious to them:[1]

"Col. Phillips,[2]
"Joseph Harris,
"James Harris,
"Major Brown's two sons
"Isaac and Josiah that
"lives at home,[3]
"Lyon Miller,[4]
Bartholomew Hains,[5]
Mr. Duncan and Brown
at Marroneck,
Capt. Joshua Purdy,[6]
Jeremiah Travess,
Solomon Fowler,[7]
Joshua Purdy,[8]
"Elijah Purdy,
"Gilbert Horton,[9]
"Edmond Ward,[10]
"Caleb Morgain,[11]
"James Horton, Esq.[12]
"William Barker, Esq.[13]
"Person Seabury,[14]
"Godfrey Haines, added
"on Saturday evening,[15]
"Jeremiah Travess, Junr.,
Jonathan Purdy, White
Plains,[16]
Saml. Merrit, Manor of
Courtlandt,[17]
Mr. Peter Hatfield,
Isaac Hatfield,
Edward Palmer,[18]
Nath. Whitney, Esq.
Pater Drake,[19]
Peter Corney,[20]
"Joshua Carne."

There need be no surprise that that remarkable enactment and the activity in enforcing its provisions which was seen among those who favored the Rebellion and among those who desired the advantages which a general breaking down of those who opposed that Rebellion would probably ensure to them, in the expected and intended sequestrations and confiscations and sales of properties, real and personal, throughout the County, aroused the attention and the indignation of the great body of the conservative

in Connecticut, as is well known, were too nearly akin in sentiment to the Towns in Westchester-county to have supplied *respectable* men, for such a questionable service; and specimens of those of Connecticut who were so zealous in the support of the Rebellion, in New York, when there was no armed forces before them—those, from that Colony were not so zealous, on the northern frontier and in Canada, at Kips Bay and in New Jersey, when an armed enemy was either before or behind them—might have been seen in those who were led by Waterbury and by Sears, by Wooster and by Webb, of whom and of whose peculiarly "New Eng-"land Ideas," concerning the laws of *meum et tuum*, history has left abundant evidence.

[1] *Historical Manuscripts*, etc.: *Miscellaneous Papers*, xxxiv., 193.

[2] Colonel Frederic Philipse, of Yonkers and Sleepy Hollow, Member of the General Assembly, already made known to the reader. He was exiled; and his property sequestrated, confiscated, and sold.

[3] Isaac and Josiah Brown were arrested; thrown into the Prison at the White Plains; and subsequently released on condition that they should board with William Miller, Deputy Chairman of the County Committee, at their own expense, instead of at their own homes.

[4] Lyon Miller was First Lieutenant in the Harrison Precinct Company of Militia, reorganized under the enactment of the Provincial Congress, in August, 1775.

[5] Bartholomew Haines was arrested and thrown into Prison at the White Plains. His name will be seen, very frequently, in the following pages of this narrative.

[6] Captain Joshua Purdy was, probably, the person of that name who has been referred to, elsewhere, in these notes, in connection with another person, bearing the same name but without a title, who was, also, named on this list of the proscribed of Westchester-county. Although the records do not mention the distinguishing title, if he had one, of the victim whose arrest and imprisonment and conditional release are mentioned in the note referred to, and, therefore, the untitled "Joshua Purdy" has been connected with those records, there are circumstances which favor the impression that *Captain* Joshua was the person to whom they really referred.

[7] Solomon Fowler was reported to the Provincial Congress, a second time, in June, 1776, and summoned to appear before the "Committee "on Conspiracies," soon after.

[8] Joshua Purdy, either this person of that name or *Captain* Joshua who is also named on this list, was reported to the Provincial Congress, a second time; summoned before the "Committee on Conspiracies;" imprisoned at the White Plains; and released from prison on condition that he should board with William Miller, Deputy Chairman of the County Committee, at his own expense, instead of at his own home.

[9] Gilbert Horton was arrested and thrown into the Prison at the White Plains.

[10] Edmund Ward was arrested and thrown into the Prison at the White Plains.

[11] Caleb Morgan was reported to the Provincial Congress, a second time; arrested; and thrown into the Prison at the White Plains.

[12] James Horton, Esq., was summoned before the "Committee of "Safety," as the County Committee called itself, in August, 1777; was unusually independent in his answers to that body; and appears to have remained without further trouble.

[13] William Barker, Esq., was reported to the Provincial Congress, a second time; arrested; examined by the Committee on Conspiracies; and thrown into the Prison at the White Plains.

[14] Rev. Samuel Seabury, soon afterwards, was seized and carried to Connecticut, where he was imprisoned. His very peculiar case will be noticed in the text, in its order.

[15] Godfrey Haines was seized, and sent to the City of New York, a few days after the transmission of this memorandum. His case will be seen in the text of this narrative, pages 115–120, post.

[16] Jonathan Purdy, of the White Plains, was arrested and thrown into the Prison at that place.

[17] Samuel Merrit was reported to the Provincial Congress, a second time; arrested; and thrown into the Prison at the White Plains.

[18] Edward Palmer was a resident of Cortlandt's Manor; and was subsequently accused of enlisting men for the Royal Army. There are some reasons for supposing that he was the young man who was so ostentatiously hung, as a spy, by the order of General Putnam, in August, 1777, of which mention will be made hereafter.

[19] Peter Drake was one of the Drakes of the Cortlandt Manor; and was an active Loyalist; but was not disturbed—he was a Drake.

[20] Peter Corney was reported to the Provincial Congress, a second time; arrested and taken before the "Committee on Conspiracies;" and permitted to go to Long Island, where he was peculiarly serviceable to those who desired to remove from that place. Because of this, the Committee of Safety and Committee on Conspiracies of the Provincial Congress, permitted his son-in-law to take and occupy his property; but the local Committee of Sequestration disregarded that permission; seized the property; and sold it, under peculiarly distressing circumstances. (*Historical Manuscripts*, etc.: *Petitions*, xxxiii., 522; *the same*: *Miscellaneous Papers*, xxxvii., 95, 99; xxxviii., 147; *Journal of Committee of Safety*, with Corney's son-in-law's affidavit, "Die Veneris, 4 ho., P.M., "June 6, 1777.")

farmers of Westchester-county—they would have been less than men, and unworthy of either respect or sympathy, had they remained passive spectators of what was then in progress, for the seizure of their persons, for the sequestration of their homes and of their estates, and for the impoverishment of their aged parents, of their wives, and of their dependent children, without just cause, without due process of Law, and by those who were in acknowledged rebellion against their recognized Sovereign. Indeed, the honest, hard-working yeomanry, throughout the entire extent of the County, those of revolutionary as well as those of conservative associations, was immediately thrown into a state of the most intense excitement; suspicion between those who had been peaceful neighbors and friends, was aroused and fostered; memories of half-forgotten piques and quarrels were recalled; and the animosities and the jealousies and the misunderstandings and the disputes of the past were revived and intensified; and, while the more zealous of the party of the Rebellion were loud in their threats and aggressive in their actions, those who constituted the great body of the inhabitants of the County and who were peaceful in all their relations, anxiously watched the progress of events, and, in some notable instances, denounced the enactments of the Provincial Congress and the Congress who had enacted them; declared their confidence—their ill-founded but honest confidence — that the Home Government would soon interfere for their protection; armed and organized themselves for their immediate security; and established strong patrols, from among themselves, to guard against surprise, by night or by day. Violence on the one side, of actions as well as of words, begat violence on the other. A lawless assault on the persons or the properties of the conservatives and the loyal, by the promptings of embittered human nature and the unwritten law of retaliation, was followed, sooner or later, by equally lawless assaults on the persons or on the families or on the properties of those, of the opposite party, who had been the original aggressors; and, very seldom, on those occasions, was a tooth or an eye regarded as a sufficient equivalent for the tooth or the eye which had been taken. "They hunted every man his "brother with a net;" the reign of peace, of happiness, and of prosperity — the era of good-feelings between neighbors, of regard among friends, of affection in families—in the old agricultural County of Westchester was ended; and partisan strife and personal and domestic misery and general waste and ruin prevailed.

Rye, even at a later period, was noted for its solid, unyielding conservatism;[1] and, in Rye and throughout Westchester-county, generally, the Purdys were peculiarly noted for their unfaltering loyalty.[2] Early in September, 1775, before the passage of the enactment by the Provincial Congress, to which reference has been made, could have become generally known throughout that "border Town," Godfrey Haines, an unmarried man, was at the house of Daniel Purdy, in Rye; and, in conversation, he condemned the reorganization of the Militia, by the Provincial Congress; declared he would not perform any duty in the new-organized Company; and denounced the Congresses and Committees, generally, saying "he had as "leave be in hell as in the hands of any of them," an opinion which was, probably, confirmed, very soon afterwards. He evidently looked forward to an expected movement of the Home Government, for the maintenance of its authority; he wished the men-of-war would move up the Sound; and, in his youthful outburst of indignation, he said he would be one of those who would indicate the persons on whom the Government should first lay the weight of its retributive power.

Of that Godfrey Haines, nothing is now definitely known beyond the facts, told by himself,[3] that he was tolerably well educated, but was without any available property; but it can be learned, from the papers in the case, that he was not a stranger in that neighborhood nor in that house. He was evidently a young man, suffering from wrongs already inflicted on him or on his personal friends, possessing a fiery temper, and warmly indignant at the movements and the threats of the revolutionary faction. He undoubtedly knew that he was among those who entertained opinions and preferences which were similar in their character to those which he had declared; but the latter may have been less willing to declare what they preferred and what their opinions were, concerning the doings of those who were, then, aspiring to the Government of the Colony—he was, however, less fortunate than they, in the expression of his opinions in the presence of one who, either through ignorance or malevolence, was mean enough to betray him.

Samson had his Delilah; and Godfrey had his Eunice. Of Delilah, not an Israelite, we know that she betrayed her lover to his enemies, to the oppressors of his kindred and his people: of Eunice, an ignorant, unmarried woman; unable to write her own name and, probably, unable to read what others had written—just such a tool, indeed, as suited the purposes of such men as, then, manipulated her spitefully-told information—and, evidently, a daughter or sister or other kinswoman of the man under whose roof and in the enjoyment of whose hospitality Godfrey was,

[1] "The People of Rye being wholly devoted to the Interest of the "Crown shut their Eyes and Ears against reason and knowledge" * * *(*Petition of George Harris*, "HARLEM, August 26, 1776"—*Historical Manuscripts, etc.: Petitions:* xxxiii., 158.)

[2] At the marriage of Gabriel Purdy to Charity Purdy, at the White-Plains, on the twenty-eighth of March, 1775, a large company, forty-seven in number, was assembled, among whom thirty-seven were Purdys, "and not a single Whig among them"—(*Rivington's New-York Gazetteer*, No. 105, NEW-YORK, Thursday, April 20, 1775.)

[3] *Petition to the Provincial Congress*, "CITY HALL, October ye 4th, "1775"—page 117, post.

when he made those utterances, we know, also, that she betrayed a guest, of the family, if not her own lover, into the hands of his enemies, into the hands of those who were oppressing his kindred and his people. She was not prompt in her treachery, which clearly indicates that it was an afterthought—probably, it was a girlish act of spiteful retaliation for some boyish affront, to which she had been subjected, subsequently to the day on which he had exposed himself to her ignorant vindictiveness. Whatever incited her, however, the story of Godfrey's outspoken utterances was told by her, within three or four weeks from the day of his visit to Purdy's; and, because he had evidently thus made himself obnoxious to the controlling faction, although he had not been previously regarded with suspicion,[1] the County Committee, with intemperate zeal, promptly proceeded to display and to exercise its new-found authority—Godfrey was arrested and taken to the White Plains, on no other accusation than the merely verbal information of the affronted Eunice; and that vindictive maiden was, also, taken to the same place, and before the same County Committee, there, in order that her accusation might be made in a more formal manner.

None of the details of the doings of that zealous County Committee, thus acting in its threefold character of prosecutor, judge, and executioner, have been recorded in history; but an affidavit was framed; and Eunice added "her mark" to it, and disappeared—even the industrious local historian has not found a place for her, in his genealogical record of the family of which she was apparently a member. The following is a copy of that affidavit, thus made, honestly or dishonestly, by Eunice Purdy, before the Committee of Safety of the County of Westchester:

"WESTCHESTER COUNTY, ss.:

"Eunice Purdy, of Rye, in the said County, "Spinster, being duly sworn upon the Holy Evange-"lists of Almighty God, deposeth and saith that, on or "about the second of September instant, Godfrey "Hains was at Daniel Purdy's, at Rye, and in con-"versation, at that time, said he understood that the "Committee or Congress had made a law to oblige all "to train under them; and that, 'damn them, if they "'came after him, they should either kill him or he "'would kill some of them; and that, dead or alive, "'he would be revenged;[2] and that he had enough "'in his pocket, then, for five or six of them.' That "he also damned the Congresses and Committees, "frequently, and said that he had as leave be in hell "as in the hands of the Congress or Committee; that "they would see if they were not all cut down, in a "fortnight, at farthest; that he wished the men-of-"war would come along the Sound; and that he wish-"ed they had raised their Company, three months "ago, for then the matter would have been settled "before that time; and further this Deponent saith "not.

"EUNICE her + mark. PURDY.

"Sworn the 28th September, 1775, "before me, "GILBT. DRAKE."

There was no other evidence than this evidently spitefully-made affidavit; and it is said Godfrey was "convicted," on this testimony, of "denying the au-"thority and speaking contemptuously of the Con-"gresses and the Committee of the County"—nothing appears to have been done on the charge, by Eunice, that he had used other and, apparently, more offensive words. He was ordered to be disarmed; but the judgment was returned unsatisfied, since he had concealed his arms and ammunition; and the Committee stated that it was highly improbable that they could be found. It was determined, however, that he was "a very dangerous man;" and, for its own peace sake as well as for its own safety, that very zealous Committee determined to send him to the Provincial Congress, in the City of New York, in order that that body might employ its more practised hand, in the further prosecution of him.

On the day after he had been tried and convicted and punished, as far as the Westchester-county Committee could do all these, [*September* 29, 1775,] Godfrey was placed in the custody of Daniel Winter, and sent to the City, the following letter, from that Committee, explaining the circumstances under which the victim had been thus transported from the County in which he had lived, being sent with him:

"WHITE PLAINS, Sept'. 29, 1775.

"GENTLEMEN:

"We send you by Mr. Daniel Winter, Godfrey "Hains, a person who was accused and convicted, be-"fore us, of denying the authority and speaking con-"temptuously of the Congresses and the Committee "of this County. He was ordered to be disarmed; and, "upon examining him respecting his arms and am-"munition, he confessed that he has a gun, pistol, "sword, powder, and ball, but refused informing the "Committee where they are; and as Hains is a single "man, the Committee think it highly improbable that "his arms can be found.

"We enclose you an affidavit which induces us to "think him a dangerous man; and therefore send "him to you to be dealt with as you think proper.

"After reading the affidavit we think it needless to "acquaint you that his conduct (by the best infor-"mation we can get) has been very extraordinary—

[1] It will be seen, by reference to the list of those who were proscribed, (*page* 114, *ante*.) that Godfrey Haines's name was not on it, as it was originally written—it was "*added*" to that list "on Saturday "evening."

[2] This remark very clearly indicated that, when Godfrey made these violent remarks, he was smarting from wrongs already inflicted on himself or on those who were dear to him, by those of the revolutionary faction in Westchester-county or by those, from Connecticut, under General Wooster or others, who had come into the County, for the support of the Rebellion.

"such as going armed, and giving out threats against "some of the Committee and the Connecticut "troops, etc.

"The committee think it extremely necessary, for "the safety of the County, that the Commissions for "the Militia Officers should be immediately for-"warded.

"We are, gentlemen,
"Your most humble servants,
"By order of the Committee,
"GILBT. DRAKE, *Chairman.*

"TO THE COMMITTEE OF SAFETY,
"FOR THE PROVINCE OF NEW YORK."

Although the Autumn was well advanced and the days had become much shorter, Winter and his prisoner and the guard who accompanied them left the White Plains early enough to reach the City before nine o'clock on the morning of the twenty-ninth of September, the day on which the letter was written;[1] and the first subject which was brought before the Committee of Safety, there, at its morning session, in the City of New York, was the letter from the Committee of Westchester-county, which Winter had brought, with his prisoner.

Although Gilbert Livingston, and Alexander McDougal, and Isaac Sears, and others of the more radical revolutionists were present, in the Committee, that body handled the subject with great caution, and determined to have no connection with it, ordering, as the result of its deliberations, "That the said "Godfrey Haines be sent back to the Committee of "Westchester, under the care of the persons who "brought him to this City; and that Mr. Paulding, a "Deputy for the said County, be requested to write a "letter to the said Committee, informing them that "it is the opinion of this Committee, that, agreeable "to the Resolutions of the Provincial Congress of this "Colony, the County Committees are altogether com-"petent for punishing and confining persons guilty "of a breach of the said Resolutions or of either of "them."[2]

The Westchester-county-men were not inclined, however, to be troubled with the subject, especially with the knowledge which they possessed concerning the temper of many of those who were within that County; and, on the morning of the thirtieth of September, Daniel Winter "represented" to the Committee in New York "that the taking the said God-"frey Haines back will be attended with danger of "his being rescued by persons inimical to the cause "of Liberty;" and that body thereupon reconsidered its Order of the preceding day, and ordered "that the "said Godfrey Haines be committed to the Jail in this "City till the further order of this Committee or the "Provincial Congress of this Colony;"[3] and into the Jail, in New York, Godfrey was accordingly cast, without, however, the slightest provision for his support, while he should remain there.

The Jail, in the City of New York, when Godfrey Haines was cast into it, was confining other victims of arbitrary and unwarranted arrests who, also, had been sent to the Congress, by the country Counties; and it may be reasonably supposed that his animosities against the Congresses and the County Committees and those who favored them, were not, in the slightest degree, modified, by his association with those prisoners or by his own imprisonment. But, notwithstanding those animosities, his necessities compelled him to seek relief; and, on the fourth of October, the fifth day of his confinement, he united with his fellow-prisoners, in the following *Petition*, probably written by himself, addressed to the Provincial Congress, which had reassembled on the morning of that day:[4]

"TO THE HONOURABLE PROVINCIAL CONGRESS.

"GENTLEMEN: As there is Six of us Confined in "Goal by your order Charg'd with misdemeanors, we "should take it kind of you if you'd bring us to Im-"ediate tryal or provide for us in our Confinement as "we have not wherewithal to suport our ourselves. "And you will oblige yours

"CITY HALL, October ye 4th, 1775.
"GODFREY HAINS, ADAM BERGH,
"TIMOTHY DOUGHTY, CHRISTIAN BERGH, JUNr.,
"JOHN DOB, DAVID DOB."

That Petition was duly presented to the Congress, on the day of its date, and was read before that body; but no action whatever appears to have been taken on it,[5] then or subsequently.

Eight days after the Provincial Congress had received and read the Petition of Godfrey Haines and his fellow-prisoners, that body received the following Resolution from the Continental Congress, which probably served to intensify rather than to ameliorate the prevailing partisan animosities; and it was certainly not well-constituted for the relief of those who were already imprisoned on similar charges:

"RESOLVED, That it be recommended to the several "Provincial Assemblies, or Conventions and Coun-"cils, or Committees of Safety, to arrest and secure "every person, in their respective Colonies, who is

[1] It is not impossible that this arrest had been made after it had become dark, on the twenty-eighth of September: it is quite clear that the Committee was in session, that the letter of transmission was written, and that Godfrey was hurried through the County, *after midnight, on the following morning.* Secrecy was probably necessary to ensure success, where the revolutionary faction was so insignificant in numbers, especially, as will be seen in the farther proceedings in this case, when those who were also active, in the maintenance of their own rights and properties, had been aroused.

[2] *Journal of the Committee of Safety*, "Die Veneris, 9 ho., A.M., Sep-"tember 29, 1775."

[3] *Journal of the Committee of Safety*, "Die Sabbati, 9 ho., A.M., Sep-"tember 30th, 1775."

[4] *Historical Manuscripts, etc.: Petitions*, xxxi., 70.

[5] *Journal of the Provincial Congress*, "Die Mercurii, 9 ho., A.M., Octo-"ber 4th, 1775."

"going at large, as may, in their opinion, endanger "the safety of the Colonies or the Liberties of "America."[1]

Appended to the copy of this Resolution which was laid before the Provincial Congress of New York, was a memorandum, not included in the official transcript of the Resolution, and without a signature, which was in these words: "To be kept as secret as "its nature will admit;" and it was accompanied by extracts from letters which the Continental Congress had received from London, in one of which the Governor of New York, William Tryon, was mentioned; and in which, also, it was said that "it would be a "capital stroke to get possession of Tryon."[2] The same good fortune which Lieutenant-governor Colden had enjoyed, in receiving early information of what was proposed or done in the secret sessions of the Continental Congress of 1774, was enjoyed by Governor Tryon, concerning the private correspondence and the secret proposals and doings of the Continental Congress of 1775;[3] and he took refuge, first, on board the *Halifax*, packet, and, subsequently, on board the *Duchess of Gordon*, the latter lying under the protecting guns of the *Asia*. The prisoners in the Jail, victims of arbitrary power, were less fortunate, in their intercourse with those exercising authority, among the revolutionary faction.

There is no record of the discharge of Godfrey Haines from the Jail, in the City of New York; but, on the contrary, when the record of the proceedings of the Committee of Safety, on the morning of the twenty-ninth of September, when he was taken before that body by Daniel Winter and the guard who had brought him from the White Plains,[4] was laid before the Provincial Congress, after the latter body had reassembled, after its recess, those proceedings were officially approved;[5] and, subsequently, the further proceedings of the Committee of Safety, on the morning of the thirtieth of September, when Godfrey was committed to the Jail, in New York,[6] were also officially approved by the same Provincial Congress.[7] He was not officially released; but, very soon after his *Petition* had been filed, without receiving any other attention, his necessities nerved his arms;[8] and, about midnight, he broke six grates out of the window of his prison, and released himself. Hastening to the wharf, on the East River, the starved fugitive, from whom all food and drink had been withheld for more than a week,[9] he "impressed," if he did not steal, a boat; and found refuge and food on board of

[1] *Journal of the Continental Congress*, "Friday, October 6, 1775;" *Journal of the Provincial Congress*, "Die Jovis, 9 ho., A.M., October 12th, 1775."

[2] *Journal of the Provincial Congress*, "Die Jovis, 9 ho., A.M., October 12 "1775."

[3] Compare the correspondence of Joseph Galloway and James Duane with the venerable Lieutenant governor of New York, and the knowledge of the latter, concerning the secret doings of the Congress of 1774, which the former, members of the Congress and pledged to secrecy, had communicated to him, (*pages* 27, 33, 34, *ante*,) with this later instance of secret information and copies of secret correspondence, "received from the "Fountain-Head," by Governor Tryon, enabling him to secure his personal safety by taking refuge, first, on the *Halifax*, a packet-ship, and, finally, on the *Duchess of Gordon*, the latter lying under the protecting guns of the *Asia*.

Judge Jones, in his *History of New York during the Revolutionary War*, (i., 61,) said that information was conveyed to the Governor by Egbert Dumond, a member of the delegation from Ulster-county, in the Provincial Congress; and de Lancey, in his *Notes* on that work, (i., 559, 560,) acquiesced in that statement. We cannot bring ourself to an agreement with those excellent authorities.

The Resolution was adopted by the Continental Congress, on Friday, the sixth of October; transmitted to the Provincial Congress, by the President of the Continental Congress, on the ninth of October; and was not laid before the Provincial Congress, until the twelfth of October, until which day Dumond could not have had any knowledge of it. But, on the tenth of October, two days before the Provincial Congress received it, Governor Tryon had received the information, "from undoubted an "thority from the City of Philadelphia," (*Governor Tryon to the Mayor of the City of New York*, "NEW YORK, 10th Oct. 1775;") and his subsequent statement, that he was in correspondence with "the Fountain-head," (*Governor Tryon to the Earl of Dartmouth*, "ON BOARD THE DUTCHESS OF "GORDON NEW YORK 11 th Nov 1775,") confirmed his former statement, that the information came "from the City of Philadelphia." Having failed to secure that guaranty of protection from the Corporation of the City of New York which the circumstances led him to ask for, he went on board the *Halifax*, on the eighteenth or nineteenth of October, (*Governor Tryon to Mayor Hicks*, "ON BOARD THE HALIFAX PACKET, 19th "October, 1775.")

As the Delegates from New York, in Philadelphia, were well-informed, not only concerning the Resolution but concerning the secret correspondence of the Continental Congress, which evidently formed a portion of the information which was communicated to the Governor, there is reason for believing that the correspondent of the Governor was a member of that Delegation; and the reader need not be told, in view of the fact that Lieutenant-governor Colden exposed the names of his correspondents, one of whom was in the Delegation of 1775, which was the particular Delegate who was undoubtedly the correspondent, also, of Governor Tryon, especially since, as was well known, the Governor's official and personal leanings were toward the Livingstons rather than toward the rivals of the latter, the De Lanceys, who had previously occupied the nearest place to the throne, in the Colony; and, especially, since the Delegate referred to was, by marriage, a member of the Livingston family.

The *Memorandum* which the Governor is said to have subsequently stated "was the ground of my subsequent conduct in removing on Board "the Packet," (*Governor Tryon to the Earl of Dartmouth*, "ON BOARD THE "DUTCHESS OF GORDON NEW YORK 11 th Nov 1775,") bears, on its face, the date when he is said to have received it—"MEM. Recd from N York: "the best authority Nov 2 1775 W T."—and it may have been sent to him by Egbert Dumond, as stated by Judge Jones and his commentator; but, when it was said to have been received, the Governor had surely been on the *Halifax* or on the *Duchess of Gordon*, more than a fortnight.

The name of the real author of that *Memorandum*, on which Governor Tryon is inconsistently said to have placed so much dependence, and the purpose for which it was transmitted to him, *after he had been warned of his danger and had secured his safety*, are questions which need not be discussed, in this place.

[4] See page 117, ante.

[5] *Journal of the Provincial Congress*, "Die Jovis, 10 ho., A.M., October "26th, 1775."

[6] See page 117, ante.

[7] *Journal of the Provincial Congress*, "Die Veneris, 10 ho., A.M., October, 27, 1775."

[8] "David Rhea says that Captain Haines told him he was put in jail "because he refused to deliver up his arms; and that his punishment "had been determined, that he should not eat nor drink until he had "delivered them up."—(*Testimony of David Rhea, before the Committee of Safety—Journal of the Committee*, "Die Sabbati, 10 ho., A.M., January "20th, 1776.")

[9] Haines was tried and sentenced, at the White Plains, on the twenty-eighth or twenty-ninth of September, when his sentence of starvation probably commenced to run. Six, if not seven, days afterwards, he petitioned for food, saying "he had not wherewithal to support himself," his jailers, in the City of New York, doing nothing more than to read his *Petition*, and to place it on their files, (*page* 117, *ante*.) It is not probable that his long fast was continued longer than the succeeding midnight

[illegible] man-of-war, then lying in the stream.[1] Captain Vandeput of that ship, treated him kindly; gave him an order for some oars; and evidently found a way to restore him to his home, in Rye. He was there, during the same month, engaged in "getting "out a parcel of oars for the man-of-war," in New York,[2] declaring, at the same time, that he "was "determined to have satisfaction on some particular "persons," evidently in retaliation for the wrongs which those persons had inflicted on him.[3]

The subsequent career of that unfortunate victim of Westchester-county's "patriotism" would afford material for a romance, as it has done that for dispassionate history. During the succeeding December [1775], in company with "one Palmer"—said to have been of Mamaroneck—he loaded the Sloop *Polly and Ann*, which he had recently purchased from Isaac Gedney, with Beef, Pork, and other Provisions; and, taking on board three quarter-casks of Madeira Wine, a package of Turnips, and other articles, all of them for General Howe, and other packages for General Ruggles, Mr. Willard, and Mrs. Ann Wood, together with Isaac Gedney, Bartholomew Haines (who was his cousin) Mr. Palmer (who was one of the owners of the cargo), and seven other persons, passengers, he sailed for Boston. He sailed from New York, on a Wednesday, the nineteenth of December, nominally for the West Indies, but undoubtedly for Boston. It appears, however, that adversity still accompanied him; and, on the following Saturday night, [*December* 23, 1775], the *Polly and Ann* was driven ashore, at Squam Beach, on the coast of New Jersey, so widely known as the "graveyard" of the mercantile marine of the world.

The savory reputation of the "wreckers" of that treacherous coast, sometimes made more treacherous by reason of the false lights displayed by those who lived there, will prepare the reader for the remainder of that sad story of adventure and of disaster—the vessel does not appear to have gone to pieces; and that and what remained of her cargo, after the "wreckers" had satisfied themselves from it, were seized by the local revolutionary Committee of Monmouth-county, and sold, not for the benefit of the owners of either the vessel or the cargo, but for whatever other purpose the Provincial Congress of New Jersey should determine; while "the Captain, Mas-"ter, and Passengers," or such of them as had not already abandoned the scene of their last affliction, after nineteen days had elapsed since the wreck of the Sloop, were ordered to be sent, duly guarded, to the City of New York, and delivered to the Committee of Safety of that Colony. As may be foreseen, Godfrey Haines was remitted to the tender mercies of those from whom he had escaped, in the preceding October.[4]

Three days after Major Henderson and his prisoners reached New York, [*January* 23, 1776,] "The Com-"mittee of Safety took into consideration the case of "Godfrey Haines, lately apprehended and sent here "by the Committee of Safety of New Jersey; are of "opinion that his many and mischievous machina-"tions are so dangerous that he ought to be kept in "safe custody and close jail; and that, by the Res-"olutions of the Continental Congress of the second "day of January instant,[5] they are fully authorized, "and that it is their duty to the Country, to have him "confined; and as the said Godfrey Haines lately "broke the Jail of this City, and escaped, when he "was confined there, as a prisoner,[6] and, continuing "his evil practices,[7] set off to navigate a vessel loaded "with Provisions to supply the Ministerial Army and "Navy, at Boston, they conceive it will be very "dangerous to keep or convey the said Godfrey "Haines to Ulster-county Jail, unless he is fettered "or manacled; therefore

"RESOLVED AND ORDERED, That the said Godfrey "Haines be conveyed to Ulster-county Jail, to be "there confined in safe and secure custody, in close "jail, until the further order of the Continental or "Provincial Congress, or of this Committee. And

"ORDERED, That the said Godfrey Haines be sent, "manacled or fettered, under guard, to Ulster-county "Jail; and that Colonel McDougal be requested to "procure an Officer, with a proper Guard of the "Militia or Minute-men of this City, to guard the "said prisoner and the other prisoners heretofore "ordered to jail, to Kingston, in Ulster-county."[8] At the same time, a letter was written to the Ulster-county Committee, "praying" that body "that very "particular directions for keeping him in safe cus-"tody, to prevent his escape, be given as to Haines,

[1] Haines made this statement to one of the guard which subsequently conveyed him to New-York, after he had been re-captured, (*Testimony of Major Henderson, before the Committee of Safety;*) and he also made the same statement to David Rhea, (*Testimony of David Rhea, before the same Committee: Journal of the Committee of Safety,* "Die Sabbati, 10 ho., "A.M., January 20 1776.")

[2] *Examination of Gilbert Budd before the Provincial Congress—Journal of the Provincial Congress,* "Die Veneris, 5 ho., P.M., November 3, "1775."

[3] *Affidavit of Philip Pinckney,* November 1, 1775—page 125, post.

[4] This statement is based on the *Affidavit of James Webb,* one of the passengers; on the *Proceedings of the Committee of Safety of New Jersey, "with respect to those Prisoners;"* on the *Supplementary Affidavit of James Webb;* on the *Testimony of David Rhea;* and on the *Statements of Major Thomas Henderson of the Monmouth-county Minute-men,* who conveyed the prisoners to New York.

[5] The reader will not fail to observe that the Committee carefully concealed the notable enactment of the Provincial Congress, of the first of the preceding September, (*vide pages* 111–113, *ante.*)

[6] The Committee made no mention of the fact that he had, then, been kept without food or water, a full week; and that, since his prayer for food had been disregarded by the Provincial Congress, he was compelled either to force his way out of the prison or to starve, (*vide page* 118, *ante.*)

[7] The only "evil practises" for which he had been condemned were "denying the authority and speaking contemptuously of the Congresses "and the Committee of Westchester-county"—Ennice Purdy had made other charges against him, which, however, had evidently been dismissed by the County Committee, (*vide page* 116, *ante.*)

[8] *Journal of the Committee of Safety.* "Die Martis, 3 ho., P.M., 23rd "Jan'y, 1776."

"as he formerly broke the Jail, in this City, and made "his escape;" and, at the same time, directing that Committee to "appoint some person whom you shall "think proper, to supply them with the necessaries of "life, at their own expense, if they can pay for them; "and if they cannot, at the public expense."[1] Agreeably to that prayer, a special Guard of Grenadiers was placed over Godfrey and his two fellow-prisoners; and the Committee, in Kingston, said, "they will be "safe, we think."[2]

The subsequent career of Godfrey Haines, as far as it is known, can be told in few words—the severity of the treatment which he had received and which he continued to receive broke down his health; and the Committee of Ulster-county was applied to, to permit him to be removed from his close confinement and to have "the liberty of the house," until he should have recovered his health and strength. Permission was accordingly given for his liberation from his manacles and his close imprisonment; and, very evidently, the sympathy of those who held him in custody was turned toward him far enough to permit him to escape.[3] We have found nothing further concerning him.

There were other arrests in Westchester-county similar to that of Godfrey Haines, one of which, that of Elijah Weeks, was followed by an attempt to rescue him, by an armed force, among the latter of whom were Isaac Gedney, Junior,[4] William Nelson,[5] Joshua Boyea, Joshua Ferris,[6] Bartholomew Haines,[7] Elijah Haines, William Haines, and John Haines, the persons who made the arrest having been Job Haddon, of Harrison Precinct, Benjamin Morrell, of New York, and Isaac Sniffen, of Rye-neck.[8]

Among those who were, also, arrested and thrown into prison, by the Committee of Westchester-county, under the provisions of the enactment of the Provincial Congress which is now under consideration, were Joshua Purdy, Caleb Morgan, John McCord, Gilbert Horton, Josiah Brown, Edmund Ward, Samuel Merrit, Philip Fowler, Gabriel Purdy, William Barker, Junior, John Besley, Isaac Brown, Bartholomew Haines, Joseph Purdy, and Jonathan Purdy; and, as an evidence of the wide-spread ruin which was inflicted on the inhabitants of the County, by the sequestrations of the real and personal estates of those who were "suspected" of being opposed to the Rebellion, there were sequestrated in the single Town of Salem, prior to the sixth of December, 1776, the properties of Ephraim Sanford, Thomas Smith, Benjamin Close, Gilbert Hunt, Samuel Baxter, Abraham Close, Job Keeler, Jonathan Wallace, Ezra Morehouse, Jacob Wallace, Samuel Wallace, Nathaniel Palmer, Nathan Osborn, Abraham Dan, Edward Jones, and George Butson.[9]

It was a reasonable consequence, under the existing circumstances, that questions should be raised, concerning the legitimacy of any such authority as the Provincial Congress had created, in these enactments, and delegated to the several local Committees, none of which were recognized by the Law of the land and all of which were antagonistic to those Laws. It was a short-sighted policy, also, even among those who were in rebellion, which inflicted penalties, especially such penalties as these, on those persons who continued, peacefully, on their respective farms, quietly pursuing their daily labors, honestly respecting the Laws of the country, and consistently recognizing and honoring the Sovereignty of the King, whom even those who were in rebellion quite as fully recognized, as their undoubted Sovereign; and these, for no other reason than for disrespectful words, concerning the several Committees and Congresses, and for the utterance of questions concerning their respective authorities. It was a reasonable consequence, under existing circumstances, we repeat, that quiet men should become excited and excitable men angry, and that all should become alarmed and indignant, when a mere handful of their neighbors, without their "consent" and without the slightest warrant of Law and without the slightest necessity, usurped and maintained such unheard-of authority as was created in these enactments; and it was equally reasonable, under the circumstances which then existed, that there should be neighborly consultations and neighborhood organizations, as well as personal efforts, for the support and protection of

---

[1] *Letter from the Committee of Safety to the Committee of Ulster-county* "IN COMMITTEE OF SAFETY, NEW-YORK, 23rd Jany, 1776."

[2] *Letter from the Ulster-county Committee to the Committee of Safety*, "KINGSTON, January 27th, 1776."

[3] *William Elsworth, Chairman of the Ulster-county Committee, to the Provincial Congress*, "KINGSTON, May 22, 1776;" *Journal of the Provincial Congress*, "Die Sabbati, 9 ho., A.M., May 25, 1776."

[4] Isaac Gidney, probably the same person, visited Governor Tryon, on the *Duchess of Gordon*, a few months afterwards, (*Examination of William Sutton before the Westchester-county Committee*, July 23, 1776.)

[5] William Nelson was one of those who, in the following year, "were "supposed to have gone to the British Army," (*List of Sundry Persons, Inhabitants of Cortlandt's Manor*, etc.: *Historical Manuscripts*, etc.: *Miscellaneous Papers*, xxxvi., 594).

[6] Joshua Ferris, a son of Caleb Ferris, was one of those who went on board the *Phœnix*, when that ship went up the Hudson, in July, 1776, (*Examination of Joshua Ferris*: *Historical Manuscripts*, etc.: *Miscellaneous Papers*, xxxv., 69, 85.) He, or another person bearing the same name, was a prisoner, in the Jail at the White Plains, in September, 1776, at which time he petitioned the Provincial Congress "that His Irons may be "taken off as he cannott posibly Shift Himself or get clear of the Ver-"min, with which he is Greatly Infected to the great disturbance of his "unfortunate fellow prisoners," (*Historical Manuscripts* etc.: *Petitions*, xxxiii., 82.)

[7] Bartholomew Haines, a cousin of Godfrey Haines, was one of those who were reported to the Provincial Congress, as obnoxious to the revolutionary faction in Westchester-county, (*page* 114, *ante*;) and he was, also, one of those who were arrested and thrown into the Jail, at the White Plains, in the Summer of 1776, (*Historical Manuscripts*, etc.: *Petitions*, xxxiii., 108.)

[8] *Letter from the Sub-committee of the Committee of Westchester-county to the Provincial Congress*, "WHITE PLAINS, November 4, 1775."

[9] The names of those who were arrested and imprisoned, which are named in the text, were copied from a single Petition for relief, (*Historical Manuscripts*, etc.: *Petitions*, xxxiii., 108); but there were many others. The names of those farmers, in Salem, whose Farms, Stock, Tools, Crops, Household Furniture, etc., were thus seized and sold, were taken from the same *Historical Manuscripts*, etc.: *Miscellaneous Papers*, xxxv., 307, in which the properties are mentioned, in detail.

the personal and domestic and political Rights which those farmers indisputably possessed, under the Constitution and the Laws of the Kingdom—they would have been unworthy of their manhood and of their families, of their homes and of their Rights, had they failed to become excited and alarmed, to have armed and organized and fought, for themselves and their wives and their little ones, for their homes and their properties and their Rights, whenever and by whomsoever and under whatever pretence of ill-gotten authority, these might have been assailed. It was a mistake, as well as a crime, therefore, to assume authority for the arrest and imprisonment of men and for the sequestration of their properties and the impoverishment of the aged and of the dependent and helpless, without a shadow of legal authority and in audacious defiance of it; without a shadow of existing necessity, even from the standpoint of the Rebellion, for the enactment of such extreme measures; and with a reasonable assurance that a manly self-respect among those who were proscribed, would be surely aroused, not only for their own and their families' protection, but, as far as they could do it, for the suppression of that haughty lawlessness which had presumed to create and to enforce so grave an enactment of despotism. It was loudly declared to have been the most ardent wish of even the most advanced advocate of rebellion, to have secured a reconciliation with the Mother Country and a restoration of harmony and good-will among the adverse parties throughout the several Colonies:[1] how much more of wisdom there would have been displayed among those who had seized the reins of government, therefore, had they practised their hands in the work of reconciliation and harmony and goodwill among their neighbors, instead of driving the staid and the quiet and the conscientious and the law-abiding, among the latter, into active and bitter partisanship, and of spreading alarm and strife and misery and ruin over the entire County. There might have been fewer transformations of moral and intellectual pigmies into potent political giants—there might have been a smaller number of fortunes rapidly and largely increased from the plunder of neighboring better-provided-for households and farmyards—but there would have been, also, fewer outrages against the Laws of both man and of God; less occasion for bitterness among the descendants of those who were, then, neighbors in locality, if not in fact; and very much less for the faithful historian to condemn and to denounce, while reciting the annals of the American Revolution, as that Revolution was developed and seen in the agricultural and prosperous and peaceful County of Westchester, in New York. But the end of such outrages had not yet come.

While the excitement occasioned by the enactments of the Provincial Congress, authorizing local Committees to seize and imprison and disarm and deprive of their estates those who should become obnoxious to those local demagogues and against whom, by fair means or by foul, an accusation of unfriendly thoughts or words against the Rebellion could possibly be trumped up, was at its height, and while some of the inhabitants of the County were already suffering from imprisonment, attended by the most distressing circumstances, under the provisions of those enactments, the Committee of Safety, whom the Provincial Congress had left on duty, with a limited authority, during a brief recess of the latter body, still further aroused the excitement and the indignation of the greater number of the Colonists in New York, of nearly all of those within Westchester-county, by the publication of the following Resolution and Orders:

"IN COMMITTEE OF SAFETY,
"FOR THE COLONY OF NEW YORK,
"September 16th, 1775.

"WHEREAS, a great number of the men enlisted in "the Continental Service, in this Colony, are destitute of Arms, and in order to carry into execution "the Resolutions of the Continental Congress, it is "absolutely necessary to have those troops armed: "AND WHEREAS, every method to hire or purchase "Arms, hitherto attempted, has failed to procure a "sufficient number of Arms for the said troops, and "the only method remaining is to impress Arms for "their use,

"RESOLVED, therefore, That all such Arms as are "fit for the use of the troops raised in this Colony, "which shall be found in the hands or custody of any "person who has not signed the *General Association* "in this Colony, shall be impressed for the use of the "said troops. And

"ORDERED, That the person or persons who shall "have the charge of the carrying this Resolution into "execution, in each County, shall direct all the Arms "that shall be so impressed, to be collected at some "place in the County where they are impressed, and "there valued and appraised by three indifferent men "of reputation of the County, any two of whom "agreeing, shall be sufficient to ascertain the price; "that an account be kept from whom every Musket, "Gun, or Firelock, so impressed, shall have been "taken; and each such Gun, Musket, or Firelock "caused to be marked with the initial letter of the "name of the County where it is impressed and num-"bered, the numbers following each other, success-"sively; and that the same be entered in a book pro-"vided for that purpose, with the name of the owner "opposite to the number marked on each Musket, "Gun, or Firelock, respectively. And

[1] "The thought that we might be driven to the sad necessity of break-"ing our connection with Great Britain, exclusive of the carnage and "destruction, which it was easy to see must attend the separation, always "gave me a great deal of grief. And even now, I would cheerfully re-"tire from public life, forever, renounce all chance for honors or "profits from the public, nay, I would cheerfully contribute my little "property, to obtain peace and liberty."—*John Adams to his Wife*, "7 "October, 1775."

"ORDERED, That a Certificate, specifying the value "and the mark of the Musket, Gun, or Firelock so "impressed, appraised, and marked, shall be signed "by the Appraisers and Impressers, which shall enti-"tle the owner thereof to receive the appraised value "from the Treasurer of the Provincial Congress of "this Colony: PROVIDED the same be not returned at "or before the conclusion of the present unhappy "controversy between Great Britain and the united "Colonies. And that an account, signed by the said "Appraisers and Impressers, of all such Muskets, "Guns, and Firelocks, so impressed, shall be sent, "forthwith, to the Secretaries of the Provincial Con-"gress, or either of them, to be filed. And that all "the Muskets, Guns, and Firelocks so impressed, on "Nassau Island,[1] be delivered, without delay, to Peter "T. Curtenius, the Commissary of the Provincial "Congress of this Colony; and those that shall be im-"pressed in the other Counties of this Colony, to be "deposited with their respective Committees, subject "to the order of the said Provincial Congress or Com-"mittee of Safety. And

"ORDERED, That the Captains of the respective "Companies of the Third Regiment of the troops of "this Colony, who are now in Suffolk-county, be "authorized to carry these Resolutions into execu-"tion in Queens-county. That Colonel Lasher[2] be "requested to send two or more Companies of his "Battalion, to give such assistance in Queens-county "as may be necessary, at such time and to such place "or places as Colonel McDougal and John Sloss Ho-"bart, Esq., shall direct or advise. And

"ORDERED FARTHER, That the Chairman of the "Committee and Captain Dutcher,[3] with such drafts "from the Militia as he shall think necessary, or with "the assistance of some of General Wooster's troops,[4] "be enabled to carry the said Resolutions into effect, "in Westchester-county. And that these Resolutions "be carried into execution, in every other County, by "the Chairman of the County Committee, with the "assistance of the Militia Officers, who are hereby "ordered to be aiding therein with such parts of the "Militia as each such Chairman shall think necessary. "And

"ORDERED, That the several persons who shall be "disarmed by virtue of the above Resolutions, shall "be exempted from doing duty in the Militia, as or-"dered by the Provincial Congress of this Colony. "And farther

"ORDERED, That in case any of the non-associators "aforesaid shall resist those persons authorized to "put these Resolutions into execution, they (the per-"sons hereby authorized to put in execution the "above Resolves) are hereby authorized to repel "force by force, and to take into custody such per-"son or persons so resisting, and cause him or them "to be brought before this Committee or the Provin-"cial Congress of this Colony."[5]

The real purpose of the Committee of Safety, in the adoption and publication of this Resolution and of these several Orders, was the entire disarmament of every one who, for any reason, had neglected or declined to sign the *General Association*; and, for that reason, every class of fire-arms, whether adapted to the uses of the Army or not, was included, in every instance, in the Orders wherein the Arms to be seized were specifically described. It will be seen, also, that the Counties of Queens and Westchester were especially noticed; and that they, alone, were selected for details of foreign troops, for the enforcement, within each of them, respectively, of the utmost requirements of the Committee's Orders—besides the local Militia, in each of the two Counties, thus honored by the Committee of Safety's malignant animosity, a large additional force of troops, from beyond the boundaries of the County, in each instance, was placed at the disposal of those who were sent, within those Counties, respectively, for the "impressment" of the Arms, in order to ensure the most complete success of the enterprise.

It must have been peculiarly galling, among those who had been accustomed to hear of the "Rights of "Man" and of the "Constitutional Rights of English-"men" and all the other catchwords and maxims in the science of government—generally true, in theory, although, practically, they had been seized and employed by demagogues, in those instances, only for the advancement of personal and partisan ends—when a military force, no matter by whom commanded nor of what troops it was composed, was moved from farmhouse to farmhouse, failing to call only on those who were in favor with the Chairman of a County Committee, for the seizure of whatever "Muskets, Guns, "and Firelocks" the occupants of those several farmhouses owned or had in their possession. Not an exception was made, no matter what reason there might have been for such an exception; and everything which had a gun-lock on it, whether useful or useless for military purposes—whether a young man's fowling-piece, with which he was wont to have a few hours' sport, when squirrels and robins abounded, or to have more serious work, when foxes and more formidable marauders poached in the poultry-yards or in the sheep-pastures; or an old man's worn-out musket, a trusty friend in earlier Wars and, now, only a remembrancer of other days and other hardships—everything was doomed, by that new-formed

[1] Long Island was continued to be called "Nassau Island," long after 1775.

[2] John Lasher was Colonel of First Regiment of New York City (uniformed) Militia.

[3] William Dutcher, of what is now Irvington, was Captain of "the "Associated Company of the upper part of Philipsborough," (*vide page* 106 *ante*.)

[4] General Wooster was encamped near Harlem, on Manhattan Island, with a large body of troops, brought thither from Connecticut.

[5] *Journal of the Committee of Safety*, "Die Sabbati, 9 ho., A.M., Septem-"ber 16th, 1775."

power, to seizure and, practically, to forfeiture. There was grave reason for increased discontent and excitement. There was ample reason, under the circumstances which then existed, for obstructing the execution of the Committee's Orders—indeed, there was greater reason for concealing the objects which the military force was expected to seize and "impress," under the provisions of these Orders, than there had been for the concealment of the Bay Colony's military stores, at Concord, when Lieutenant-colonel Smith and Major Pitcairn were sent to seize them, and for resisting the aggression of the Committee, than there had been for the punishment of the invader, in that instance, after his work had been finished, on the highway, between Concord and Charlestown.[1]

It is said that, in Queens-county, "the people "conceal all their Arms that are of any value; many "declare they know nothing about the Congress, "nor do they care anything for the Orders of the "Congress, and say that they would sooner lose their "lives than give up their Arms; and that they would "blow any man's brains out, who should attempt to "take them from them. We are told," the writer continued, "that the people have been collecting "together, and parading, in sundry places, armed, "and firing their Muskets, by way of bravado. On "the whole, had we the Battalion" [*Lasher's*] "we "believe we should be able to collect a very consider-"able number of good Arms and support the honour of "Congress; but without it, shall not—and think that "if the Battalion is sent up, the sooner the better."[2]

There are no known records of the doings of Gilbert Drake and Captain William Dutcher, in their tours of pillage, among the conservative and peaceful farmers of Westchester-county; but there appears, from a brief mention which has been made, in other connections, that the men of that County, like those of Queens-county, armed themselves, and patroled the County, in large parties, to guard against surprises; declaring their determination to defend themselves, and saying "that if any body came to "their houses to take away their Arms, they would "fire upon them."[3] It appears, also, that the declaration was fully sustained; that the united farmers proved more than a match for the local Militia and the other troops which the Chairman of the County Committee had been authorized to call for his support; and that, for the more effectual accomplishment of his purposes, that Chairman had assumed still further authority, by calling on the floating population of the neighboring Towns, in Connecticut, for reinforcements[4]—as the Chairman of the County Committee was authorized by the Committee of Safety, to call for the entire Militia of the County, already seem to have been sufficient to fill three Regiments,[5] and as many of General Wooster's command of Connecticut troops, then encamped below Harlem,[6] and numbering "about 400 men,"[7] as should be required, that opposition must have been wide-spread and resolutely maintained, in Westchester-county, which had required, in addition to all these, for its suppression, an additional force, drawn from what may be properly called the Swiss Guards of Colonial America, mercenaries, who, while they professed to have been ardent friends of Freedom, were, nevertheless, whenever they could see any possible advantage to their individual interests, constantly ready to enlist in any service, outside of Connecticut, and to become, in their new associations, the most devoted of all supporters of despotism and the most relentless of all persecutors of those, no matter of what country, who dared to question the sanctity of the assumed authority of those who employed them.

---

[1] Doctor Sparks noticed this outrage, in these words: "The Committee "reasoned but imperfectly from the facts of history and the principles of "human nature, when they supposed that people, with arms in their "hands, would be tempted to resign them, by such motives as were held "out. They must either be treated as friends or enemies. If friends, "their safety and interest required that the soldiers who were to pro-"tect their property and defend their rights should be armed; and the "call of patriotism would be the loudest that could be made to them. "While deaf to this call, they would not be made to listen to the Orders "of a Committee or the Resolves of a Congress. If enemies, the sense "of present danger, operating on the first law of nature, would prompt "them to keep within their power, their only sure means of defence. "In either case, the idea of taking away their arms, by a compulsory "impressment, had little to recommend it, either in policy or prudence." —(*Life of Gouverneur Morris*, i., 63.)

The Doctor reasoned, above, on the ground that the *Order* of the Committee was an isolated act, disconnected with any other of the class; and he reasoned well, on that premise; but the fact was, another *Order* had just been made, *in secret*, to seize the persons and properties of those who were obnoxious to the Committee and its subordinates; and it was considered necessary, for the safety of the marauders, to deprive the secretly proposed victims of that earlier enactment, of their means for defence, before it commenced, openly, its work of lawlessness and outrage on the persons and properties of those who had been or who should, thenceforth, be designated as its victims.

[2] *Letter from Major William Williams to the Committee of Safety*, "JAMAICA, September 25th, 10 o'clock P.M."

Major Williams appears to have been a resident of Queens-county.

[3] *Testimony of Colonel Gilbert Budd of Mamaroneck, before the Provincial Congress,—Journal of the Provincial Congress*, "Die Veneris, 10 ho. A.M., "November 3, 1775," (*vide page* 126, *post.*)

[4] This conflict between those who were executing the Orders of the Committee of Safety, for the disarmament of those who had not signed the *Association*, and those, in Westchester-county, who were intended to have been the victims of the Committee's aggressive policy, has been studiously concealed by all who have written on the subject of the American Revolution; but the Provincial Congress, on the twelfth of December, gave the formal thanks of that body "to those of the In-"habitants of the Colony of Connecticut, who so cheerfully gave "their aid, at the request of the Committee of Westchester-county, "in the late suppression of the Insurgents in that County, against the "cause of Liberty." (*Journal of the Provincial Congress*, "Die Martis, 3 "ho., P.M., Decr. 12th, 1775,") which is ample authority, for the statement, in the text.

[5] See pages 105, 106, 107, ante.

[6] General Wooster and his command were encamped on property belonging to Arent Bussing, near Harlem, from the eighteenth of July, preceding, (*Journal of Provincial Congress*, "Die Martis, 9 ho., A.M., "July 18th, 1775.")

[7] "General Wooster is at Harlem, with about 400 men, which appear "to us to be unemployed." (*Letter from the Committee of Safety to the Continental Congress*, "IN COMMITTEE OF SAFETY FOR THE COLONY OF NEW "YORK, DURING THE RECESS OF THE PROVINCIAL CONGRESS, NEW-YORK "Sept. 19, 1775.")

It is proper that notice shall be taken, in this connection, of the fact that the Provincial Congress, on the twenty-fourth of October, twenty days after that body had returned to its place and to its work and thirty-eight days after its Committee of Safety had adopted and published the Resolution and Orders, "relating to the impressment of Arms," which have been thus described and denounced, passed a formal Resolution "disapproving" and, therefore, abrogating them;[1] but the mischief which had necessarily proceeded from the adoption and publication and attempts to execute that Resolution and those Orders, could not be undone; the wounds which had been inflicted, were too deep to be healed by such an emollient; and an increased and constantly increasing bitterness of feeling, between the conservative and the revolutionary portions of the inhabitants, was every where seen, scattering its baleful and ruinous influence, from one extreme of the County to the other.

The radical changes in the characters and conduct of the previously quiet and orderly and industrious and prosperous inhabitants of Westchester-county, which were produced by the succession of aggressive enactments, made and published by the Provincial Congress and by its Committee of Safety, may be seen in the following letter and in what followed it, while that Provincial Congress was in session:

"WHITE PLAINS, November 1st, 1775."

"SIR:

"The Committee of Westchester-county, having "been called together upon a request of some of their "body, upon suspicion of a plot being contrived to "carry off several of the members and some others "who had shewed themselves zealously attached to "the Liberties of this country, Mr. Philip Pinkney,[2] "(who had given very full information, to some of the "Committee, of the plot, and had offered to swear to "it, provided he was brought by the Committee by "an appearance of force, and had engaged not to be "out of the way,) upon being sent for, by some of the "guard attending the Committee, was not to be "found; whereupon some of the Committee, by order "of the whole, waited upon Mr. Pinkney, who, after "refusing to come before the Committee, and after a "great deal of equivocation, made the enclosed affi-"davit, before a Magistrate, which we have reason to "think is not the whole truth; for which reasons we "refer you to Colonel Budd[3] and Mr. Gill. Budd "Horton,[4] with whom Mr. Pinkney has conversed.

"As we are only a Sub-committee appointed to take "the examination of Mr. Pinkney and such other "persons as might be necessary, and to make a Re-"port of our Proceedings to the Honourable the Pro-"vincial Congress, we beg leave to request that Mr. "Pinkney may be sent for and critically examined, "by the Congress, respecting the above matter, and "with relation to Oars being made by the request of "Captain Vandeput;[5] and, also, that William Davis, "(who was employed in making the Oars,) and Sarah "Williams, the wife of Isaac Williams, of Westchester, "may also be sent for and examined as witnesses, "respecting them.

"We also request that Mr. William Lounsberry,[6] "Isaac Gedney, Junior, and three hired men who "work at Justice Sutton's,[7] may be sent for, on account "of what Mr. Pinckney has related, though not sworn "to, that they, among others, were Minute-men, as he "called them; that they were to be ready, at a "moment's warning, to take off some persons who "were the most obnoxious.

"We would also request, when the others are sent "for, that the before-mentioned Isaac Gedney, Junior, "and William Nelson, Joshua Boyea, Joshua Ferris, "Bartholomew Hains, Elijah Hains, William Hains, "and John Hains, be also taken and brought before "the Honourable Congress, for taking up arms to "rescue Elijah Weeks, who was brought before the "Committee upon a charge against him. Upon the "charge, we would mention the Widow Margaret "Gedney, of the White Plains, (where they left their "Arms), Job Haddon, of Harrison Precinct, Benjamin "Morrell, of New-York, and Isaac Sniffen, of Rye-"Neck, as witnesses.[8]

"For evidence to the other charges, we beg leave to

[1] *Journal of the Provincial Congress*, "Die Martis, 9 ho., A.M., October 24th, 1775."

[2] There is not the slightest mention of this evidently tricky Philip, in any of the contemporary records with which we have any acquaintance, except in this instance; and we suspect he was that loyalist, Philip, who fled to Nova Scotia, at the close of the War, of whom Bolton made mention. He was evidently well-fitted for a "Cow-boy;" and, very probably, he was one.

Bolton, in his *History of Westchester-county*, (original edition, i., 155, 156; *the same*, second edition, i., 248, 249.) gave a sketch and pedigree of the family.

[3] Gilbert Budd of Mamaroneck, was Lieutenant-colonel of the Second Regiment of Westchester-county Militia, (*Historical Manuscripts*, etc.: *Military Returns*, xxvi., 13—*pages* 107, 108, *ante*.)

Bolton, in his *History of Westchester-county*, (original edition, ii., 80, 81, 509; *the same*, second edition, 197, 715, 716,) gave an account of his family.

[4] Gil. Budd Horton, of Mamaroneck, was the only representative of that Town, in the County Committee of 1776–7, (*Historical Manuscripts*, etc.: *Miscellaneous Papers*, xxxviii., 309.) He was captured and carried away, by the Royal troops or by the local loyalists, in 1777, (*Historical Manuscripts*, etc.: *Petitions*, xxxiii., 710.)

[5] Captain Vandeput commanded the *Asia*, man-of-war, then at New York. Concerning the making of these Oars, vide page 119, ante.

[6] See page 126, post.

[7] "Justice Sutton" was the "William Sutton, Esq." who was one of the signers of the call for the Meeting at the White Plains, in April, 1775, as well as one who signed the *Declaration and Protest*, at the same place, against the proceedings of that Meeting, (*vide pages* 70, 72, *ante*.) He was one of the King's Justices of the Peace; and one of those who were reported to the Committee on Conspiracies, in June, 1776, and ordered to be arrested, (*Historical Manuscripts*, etc.: *Miscellaneous Papers*, xxx., 156.) He was summoned to appear before the Committee, (*Ibid*, xxxv., 485;) and his examination, before the County Committee, on the twenty-third of July, 1776, indicated the temper of that body against the De Lanceys, and all who were connected with that family, either by kinship or in politics, (*Ibid*, xxxiv., 531, 605, 537, 535.)

[8] See page 120, ante.

[illegible] you to Colonel Budd and Mr. Gill. Budd [illegible].

"We would not have troubled the Congress about "apprehending the above-named persons, but that "we look upon ourselves, at present, too weak to do "it, without great danger;[1] and we beg leave to sub-"mit it, whether it be not necessary, for the security "of many amongst us, as well as to prevent Provisions "being conveyed to the Ministerial Army, that a "Guard be placed along the Sound, in this County.

"We are, Sir,

"Your most humble servants,

"JONATHAN G. TOMPKINS,[2]
"THOMAS THOMAS,[3]
"JESSE HUNT,[4]
"MICAH TOWNSEND,[5]
"ANTHONY MILLER.[6]

"To NATHANIEL WOODHULL, President
"of the Provincial Congress in New York."

The Affidavit referred to in this letter was as follows:

"WESTCHESTER COUNTY, ss.

"Personally appeared before me, James Horton, "Junior, one of His Majesty's Justices of the Peace "in and for said County,[7] Philip Pinkney, of full age, "who deposeth and saith, that on Wednesday, the "twenty-fifth day instant,[8] being in company, he "heard one say that Godfrey Haines was determined "to have satisfaction on some particular persons,[9] and "that there was a tender expected, to take them off, "instantly; and that this Deponent was asked if he "would assist in taking off Judge Thomas,[10] private-"ly; and that they were determined to have him, if "possible"; and that there was a person to be in a "particular place, to receive him from those that took "him.

"PHILIP PINCKNEY.

"Taken and sworn before me this
"first day of November, 1775,
"JAMES HORTON, JUNR."[12]

The Provincial Congress received the letter and the affidavit, and placed them on file, without taking any other action which was recorded on its *Journal*, than the making of an Order that Colonel Budd and Gil. Budd Horton, who had evidently taken those papers to the Congress, should attend that body, at five o'clock, on the same afternoon.[13] At the appointed hour, those gentlemen made their appearance before the door of the Assembly Chamber, in the City Hall, in which the Congress was assembled in secret Session; and when they were admitted into the Chamber, they were duly examined—the testimony of Gil. Budd Horton, however, was evidently so entirely useless that it was not reduced to writing, and, consequently, no portion of it was entered on the *Journal of the Provincial Congress*. The testimony of Colonel Gilbert Budd, as it appears on that *Journal*,[14] is in these words:

"Col. Gilbert Budd and Gilbudd Horton, from "Westchester County, attending according to order, "were called in, and examined; and the examination "of Gilbert Budd was taken in writing, and filed, and "is as follows, to wit:

"Gilbert Budd, of Mamaroneck, says that the tories "are getting the upper hand of and threaten them, "daily, and have injured their private property, by "throwing down stone fences and cropping his horses' "tails and manes; that Philip Pinckney told him, "last Sunday, that he was in company, on the twenty-"fifth of October last, with a man who told him that "there would be bad times in Mamaroneck, before "long; and said that some of the people of "the place would be taken off; that he, Pinck-"ney, asked the man that told him, how they were to "be taken off; he answered, that they expected a ten-"der, in the harbour, in a few days; and that she "would send barges on shore, in order to carry the "people off; that he, Pinckney, further asked the "man, where they were to be carried to, and he an-"swered, 'To Gage.' Mr. Budd told Pinckney that "Gage was not there; he answered, 'To Gage's "'Army;' that Pinckney said he asked the man, who "the men were that were to be taken off; that the

[1] The puny faction which, with the aid of the military power, was exercising such a terrible authority, in Westchester-county, here confessed its weakness, when unsupported by that power.

[2] See page 108, ante.

[3] See page 107, ante.

[4] Jesse Hunt was Sheriff of Westchester-county, 1781–1785.

[5] Micah Townsend was a member of the County Committee of 1775–'6, and its Secretary; he was one of the Minute-men, at White Plains, in February, 1776; and he was in command of a Company, in the following Summer. He evidently left Westchester-county, soon afterwards, as he was in the Assembly of the State, in 1779–'80, representing Cumberland-county.

[6] Anthony Miller was Second Lieutenant of the Scarsdale and White Plains Company of Militia, in 1775, and Captain of the same Company, in 1776.

[7] James Horton, Junior, was proscribed as a Tory, and ordered to be arrested in June, 1776, (*Historical Manuscript*, etc.: *Miscellaneous Papers*, xxx, 156.)

[8] This date was, evidently, a clerical error. It was, undoubtedly, intended for "the twenty-fifth *ultimo*," October 25, 1776.

[9] Of Godfrey Haines, his grievances, and his threats, see pages 115–120, *ante*.

[10] "Judge Thomas" was Hon. John Thomas, County Judge of Westchester-county, 1755–1777, and Member of the General Assembly of the Colony, representing the county of Westchester, 1743–'75, in which latter capacity the reader has already been made acquainted with him.

[11] Although the project of carrying Judge Thomas away from his home, in 1775, if such a project was really entertained, was not carried out; a similar project, in 1777, was successful; and he was carried to New York, as Haines had been, and thrown into prison, in that City, as Haines had been, (*vide pages* 116, 117, *ante*,) and died there.

[12] The entire prostration of the Colonial Government, in New York, and its entire helplessness to protect the Colonists from the outrages to which they were subjected by the promoters of the Rebellion, is nowhere more clearly seen than in this appearance of one of those who were in rebellion, before one of the King's Justices of the Peace, to make an official affidavit concerning a plot to carry away from his home, one of the leaders in that Rebellion, by those who were not in rebellion.

[13] *Journal of the Provincial Congress*, "Die Veneris, 10 ho., A.M., No-"vember 3d, 1775."

[14] *Journal of the Provincial Congress*, "Die Veneris, 5 ho., P.M., Novem-"ber 3, 1775."

"man intimated to him that Mr. Gilbert Budd" [*the witness*] "and Mr. Samuel Townsend[1] were the men "that were to be taken off; and that there was another "that they would have, at all events; that Pinckney "told Budd that he asked the man, who the other "man was that was to be taken off; that the man an-"swered him that Judge Thomas was the man, who "they would have if it cost them the lives of fifty "men; that Pinckney told the said Mr. Budd that "there was a number of his, Budd's, neighbours, who "stood ready to assist the tender, in order to take "them; that Mr Budd asked Pinckney if he knew "who those neighbours were; he answered that one "of them was William Lounsberry[2] and one, Isaac "Gedney, Junr., and all Sutton's men, alluding to "some hired servants of Sutton's;[3] that Pinckney "said he came as a friend, and advised Mr. Budd to "keep out of the way, for that he did not think it safe "for him to sleep in his house, one night. Mr. Budd "further says that he heard that Godfrey Haines said "that he was going to get a parcel of Oars made for "the man of war; that Haines came to Mamaroneck, "and that the next day, Isaac Gedney set about mak-"ing Oars; that they were making (as Budd under-"stood) by Haines's order, for Capt. Vandeput. Mr. "Budd says the tories are equipped, and constantly "in arms, walking about, at night, 6, 8, and 10 at a "time. Mr. Budd further says that it is reported that "those tories say they are determined to defend them-"selves; and that if any body came to their houses to "take away their Arms, they would fire upon them."

The Congress appears to have been in one of its temperate moods when that delegation from the chivalry of Colonial Westchester-county, bearing the missive from the Committee of that County and its kindred Affidavit, approached its doors; and for that reason, unless it was because of the shallowness of the several accusations and requests which were in the papers or of the poltroonery of those who bore them the Congress did no more than to order the letter and affidavit and examination to be filed; to charge all who knew of "this matter," "to keep the whole of it "a secret;" and to transmit a letter to the Committee of Westchester-county—the latter, the most noteworthy of all that it did, in "this matter"—of which the following is a copy:

"IN PROVINCIAL CONGRESS,
"AT NEW-YORK, November 3rd, 1775.

"GENTLEMEN:

"We received a letter of the 1st inst., from the "Sub-committee of your County, relative to the "conduct of the people of Rye; and the Congress "have directed me to recommend to your Com-"mittee to make an immediate and strict inquiry "into the matters to which the letter refers, and "to take the examinations on oath of the wit-"nesses; and if you find satisfactory reasons to sup-"pose the persons threatened to be in danger, that "you take the proper means to protect them; perhaps "the binding over to the peace such persons as may "be strongly suspected of a design to injure the per-"sons or estates of those gentlemen, may be a useful "expedient.[4] If anything afterwards shall be thought "necessary to be done, for their further protection, "the Committee will attend to it. If you should "find the County unable to give the necessary pro-"tection, you will transmit the examinations to us, "that the Congress may take such order therein, as "may be proper. The Committee may rest assured "that this Congress will support the friends of "Liberty, to the utmost of their power.

"We are, Gentlemen, your humble servants,
"By order of the Provincial Congress,
"ABRAHAM YATES, JR., *Pres't.*

"TO GILBERT DRAKE, Esq., *Chairman*
"*of the Committee of Westchester-county.*"[5]

The suggestion which was made in this letter, that those of the revolutionary faction, in Westchester-county, whose safety was imperiled by the threats of their conservative and law-abiding neighbors, should go before the King's Magistrates and ask that the latter should be put under bonds to keep the peace towards the former, was received with disfavor by Isaac Sears, of New York, and Melancton Smith, of Duchess-county, and Doctor Lewis Graham and John Thomas, Junior—the latter a son of one of those who had been threatened with removal from the County—and an attempt was made by them to strike out from the letter that portion "which refers them" [*the Committee of Westchester-county*] "to the Civil Magis-"trate;" but the Congress declined to make the

[1] Samuel Townsend represented the Town of Rye, in the County Committee of 1776-'7.

[2] On the twenty-ninth of August, 1776, "one Lounsberry of Westchester "County who had headed a party of about 14 Tories was killed by a Per-"son named Flood on his refusal to surrender himself Prisoner; That in "his Pocket book was found a Commission signed by Genl. Howe to "Major Rogers empowering him to raise a Battalion of Rangers with the "Rank of Lieut Col Commandant. That annexed to this was a Warrant "to this Lounsberry signed by Major Rogers appointing him Captain in "one of these Companies A a Muster Roll of the men already enlisted," (*Letter from the Committee of Safety to General Washington*, "IN COMMIT-"TEE OF SAFETY, HARLEM, Aug. 30th, 1776.")

Very probably, the William Lounsberry who is mentioned in the text was the same Lounsberry who had accepted a Commission from Major Rogers, and was killed, in August, 1776, as stated in the letter.

[3] The Sutton referred to was William Sutton, Esq., living on De Lancey's Neck, of which he was the tenant, (*vide page* 124, *ante*.)

[4] This remarkable suggestion, that those, in Westchester-county, who were in rebellion, and who were threatened with arrest by those of their neighbors who were not in rebellion, should go before the King's Justices of the Peace, and ask that those loyal inhabitants who were inclined to support the Home and Colonial Governments and the Laws and to arrest those who were in rebellion, *should be put under bonds to preserve the peace toward the latter*, will be duly appreciated by the reader. Whatever the County Committee of Westchester-county may have thought of it, it will be evident to the reader that the Provincial Congress, when it wrote to that Committee and made that suggestion, was not inclined to regard the men of Westchester-county who were in rebellion as entitled to very much of its respect and sympathy.

[5] *Journal of the Provincial Congress*, "Die Veneris, 5 ho., P.M., Novem-"ber 3, 1775."

solicited change, only the four gentlemen already mentioned having arisen in favor of it. The letter was transmitted to the Westchester-county Committee; and nothing more was heard on the subjects referred to; and the Committee itself, thenceforth, gradually disappeared from the notice of the world.

The Provincial Congress had continued in session, closely withdrawn from the sight of its constituents, until the eighth of July,[1] when it had taken a fortnight's rest, during which period a "Committee of "Safety" was left on duty, with large authority, to administer the affairs of the new organization.[2] On the twenty-sixth of July, it had resumed its work, continuing it without interruption, until the second of September, when it had adjourned for a month,[3] during which period, a "Committee of Safety" had again administered the affairs of the new organization.[4] On the fourth of October, it had re-assembled, and resumed its work, continuing it until the fourth of November, when it adjourned, or was dissolved, without day.[5]

The dissolution of the first Provincial Congress, which occurred at about the close of the first half-year of the entire and, as far as the Colonial and Home Governments were concerned, of the undisputed, domination of the revolutionary faction of the purely aristocratic portion of the Colonial party of the Opposition and its plebean auxiliaries, over the vastly greater body of those who were its fellow-men and fellow-subjects of the Crown and fellow-colonists, within the Colony of New York,—without, however, having interfered with the administration of the public affairs of the Colony, by the Royal Colonial Government, which was continued in all else than in the protection of the Colonists and in the suppression of the revolt, which that Colonial Government had not the means for doing—affords a favorable opportunity for the careful student of the history of that eventful period to rest, and to review the progress of events, in New York, during the preceding six months; to ascertain, by comparison of its earlier professions with its later practises, how much of sincerity and how much of deceit and of fraud there had been, in the apparent devotion of that controlling faction to "the Rights of man and of Englishmen," of which it had said so much, in its earlier movements toward political supremacy; to learn its matured views concerning the arrogantly assumed prerogatives of the well-born and the contemptuously assigned mission of the lowly, the latter to nothing else than to submission, to obedience, and to labor; and to ascertain and to examine those systems of government and those methods of administration which, in the unrestrained exercise of its recently acquired, but undisputed, power, and of its seemingly cultured intellect, that revolutionary faction had practically regarded as fit and proper for the government of a "free people."

* * * * * * *

During the interval, between the dissolution of the first and the organization of the second of the series of Provincial Congresses which controlled the destinies of the Colony of New York and crowded an unwilling community into rebellion and ruin, an illustration was made, first in the County of Westchester and then in the City of New York, of the spirit of the controlling power, among the disaffected; of the shallowness of the prevailing pretensions to patriotism and personal integrity in those who were engaged in the revolt; and of the personal character of the ruffians who were employed—as they had been employed in the Stamp-act and other riots, earlier in the struggle of parties—by those who were the master-spirits, in the works of lawlessness by means of which the Rebellion was promoted and established and made respectable.[6]

At that time, there was no newspaper-press in the Colonies which was conducted with greater ability than Rivington's *New-York Gazetteer; or Connecticut, Hudson's River, New-Jersey, and Quebec Weekly Advertiser*, which was published, weekly, by James Rivington, in the City of New York. It was a newspaper, in the proper sense of the word; and it published the news of the day, from every quarter of the world, regardless of their political character, with rare industry and the most liberal impartiality. It did not accord with the interests of some nor with the passions of others, however, that such a faithful recorder of the sayings and doings of every faction and of every party should be continued in the Colonies; and there were times, also, when the exposure of the double dealings of particular individuals, of high as well as of low degree, in well-printed columns, in a widely circulated newspaper, as James Rivington had done, in his *Gazetteer*, were distasteful to those who were thus exposed and unwelcome to those whom the culprit was serving. It was evidently determined, therefore, that James Rivington should be silenced; and that his only means for inflicting pain on the persons of those who favored the Rebellion should be taken from him.

There was, also, at that time, no one, in the Colony of New York, who possessed greater intellectual and executive abilities combined with superior scholastic attainments, than Samuel Seabury, a Missionary of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, ordinarily known as "The Venerable "Society," Rector of the Established Church in the

[1] *Journal of the Provincial Congress*, May 22, until July 8, 1775.

[2] *Journal of the Committee of Safety*, July 11, until July 25, 1775.

[3] *Journal of the Provincial Congress*, from July 26, until September 2, 1775.

[4] *Journal of the Committee of Safety*, from September 4, until October 3, 1775.

[5] *Journal of the Provincial Congress*, from October 4, until November 4, 1775.

[6] "This I know, a successful resistance is a 'REVOLUTION,' not a 'RE-"'BELLION.' 'REBELLION,' indeed, appears on the back of a flying en-"emy; but 'REVOLUTION' flames on the breastplate of the victorious "warrior."—(JOHN WILKES, *in the House of Commons*, February 6, 1775.)

Borough Town of Westchester, and Master of a Boarding-school for Boys, in the same Town. He was the friend and Pastor of Isaac Wilkins, the able leader of the conservative majority of the Opposition, in the General Assembly of the Colony; and the Manor of Morrisania was within the boundaries of his Parish; and the Morrises, brothers-in-law of Isaac Wilkins, but masquerading as leaders in the Rebellion, were, nominally, if not in reality, among his parishioners. He was learned, as was well-known: he was fearless in the declarations and support of his well-considered opinions, as was known to his neighbors and friends: that his convictions led him to support the conservative portion of the Opposition, led by his friend, Isaac Wilkins, is more than probable: that the same convictions led him to oppose, within the circle of his influence and consistently with his ministerial duties, the doings of the revolutionary faction of the Opposition, among whom his neighbors and parishioners, the Morrises, were capering, was no secret. When the press was teeming with publications, adverse to the violence of the revolutionary faction, he was improperly designated as one of the very few who had written them, with no other evidence to support the allegation than his recognized ability and fearlessness; and when "A. W. FARMER" appeared, with his practised and powerful pen, arousing the most violent bitterness of those who were in rebellion, the intellectual rustic who had written them, by common consent, was erroneously but reasonably said to have been the Schoolmaster and Parson at Westchester, while the real but unrecognized author of the obnoxious publications was generally passed, unnoticed. The political Parson, therefore, was very offensive to those of the revolutionary faction who were not his neighbors—"in justice to the rebels of East and West "Chester, I must say," he wrote, in 1776, "that none "of them ever offered me any insult or attempted to do "me any injury that I know of"—and it was evidently determined that he, also, like James Rivington, should be silenced, even at the expense of his personal liberty and of all which was dear to him, on earth.

There was one man, more than all others, who was qualified to enter on any adventure, no matter how lawless nor how atrocious, provided, and only provided, he could have an abundant force to support him and to overpower any opposition which might possibly arise to obstruct or to endanger him. He had been a privateer, in the War with France and Spain; and in the only encounter which he had had with an enemy, he had shown the white feather of cowardice, his crew having become his accusers. He was known, subsequently, as one of those blustering, reckless, law-defying leaders of the floating denizens of the docks, in New York, ready to disregard all Rights, all of every thing except their own wills, in acts of which only the traditional pirates and banditti were supposed to have been capable of performing, whenever, and only whenever, in his judgment, those acts could be done without personal risk to the aggressors and whenever, and at no other time, those acts of lawlessness promised that the plunder to be secured therefrom would afford a sufficient compensation.

He had married the daughter of the keeper of a low, unlicensed alehouse, a resort of sailors, boatmen, stevedores, and such as they, opposite to Beekman's Slip, and that alehouse was his rendezvous;[1] and those who had resorted to Jasper Drake's, had always been his ready instruments, in whatever acts of violence in which he had ventured to engage. He had never possessed the entire confidence of the leaders of the revolutionary faction of the Opposition, in the City of New York: he had never been taken into the *sanctum sanctorum* of that coterie of Livingstons and of Smiths and of Scotts, whose had been the unseen master-hands by whom such puppets as he had been handled and made conspicuous: he had never been permitted to occupy any place, in Committee or in Congress, unless in minorities which, because of their comparative insignificance, were incapable of disturbing the harmony of the aggregate bodies into which they had been adroitly introduced.

At the time of which we write, he was an ignorant blusterer, as vain as he was ignorant; and he needed only, as General Charles Lee said of him, "to have "his back clapped" by some one in authority and to be shown that it would be useful to himself—if he could be vested with an office, no matter what nor how ephemeral in its character nor how "impu-"dently" bestowed, so much the better—to be ready, at short notice, to exercise his entire power, as a ruffian of the dirtiest water, in any required act of lawlessness, regardless of any Rights of Person or of Property, or of any claim which age or sex might interpose. He called himself a Merchant, in the City of New York; but he had been more conspicuous in shipping Merchandise and Provisions to the eastward, clandestinely, when such shipments to the eastward were interdicted, than in any more legitimate business. He had been a member of the recently dissolved Provincial Congress, during a portion of its existence; but, in entire harmony with his earlier proclivities, when there were threatenings of danger from the Home Government, he had abandoned the

[1] A letter from John Case, from the County of Suffolk, on Long Island, "to the Printer of the *New-York Gazetteer*," and published in *Rivington's New-York Gazetteer*, No. 91, NEW-YORK, Thursday, January 12, 1775, narrated the method in which those who were not inclined to favor the theories and practises of the revolutionary faction were inveigled into that Tavern, and, there, subjected to the teachings of Alexander McDougal, Isaac Sears, and others of that faction; and a description of the insults and outrages inflicted on those who were inclined to object to the subject matters of those teachings, by those ale-house "patriots," especially by Isaac Sears, may also be seen, in the same letter.

The attempted reply to John Case, in which Isaac Sears subsequently attempted to raise new issues instead of meeting old ones, served only to establish, more clearly, the truthfulness of Case's original statement; and those who shall incline to pursue the inquiry, may find it in Holt's *New-York Journal*, No. 1671, NEW-YORK, Thursday, February 2, 1775.

City of New York; and, in the latter part of November, 1775, Isaac Sears was safely housed in New Haven, although it is evident that he continued to correspond with the leaders of the Rebellion, in the former City.

On Monday, the twentieth of November, 1775, that cowardly ruffian, Isaac Sears, accompanied with sixteen others of the same class, all of them mounted, left New Haven, in Connecticut, for the purpose of regulating Westchester-county.[1] It had become a favorite pastime, among the rowdies on the borders of Connecticut, as it has been a favorite pastime among Texan rowdies of a later period, in their country, to make depredatory raids on those who lived on the opposite side of the river-boundary; and those "border ruffians," in revolutionary Connecticut, had been encouraged to raid on the conservative farmers, in Westchester-county; to overpower those farmers with numbers and, especially after the disarming process had deprived the latter of the means for protecting themselves or their property, to rob them of whatever could be carried away; to return to their own side of the Byram-river, well-laden with whatever had pleased them best, on the farms and in the farm-houses which they had visited; and to enjoy, in their own "Christian New England," the stolen products of other men's honest and earnest toil, and to be cheered, as "patriots," by their "Christian New "England" neighbors.

The avowed purpose of that band of acknowledged "banditti"[2] was "to disarm the principal tories "there," [*at East and West Chester,*] "and secure the "persons of Parson Seabury, Judge Fowler, and "Lord Underhill," three residents of Westchester-county; and it is said they were joined, on their way, by other parties of men, numbering about eighty, under the leadership of "Captains" Richards, Sillick, and Mead.[3] It was not pretended that these enterprising Connecticut-men had any other warrant to engage in such an undertaking, than that afforded in the propensity of every cowardly thief to plunder those who were known to have been stripped of their means for defence, and who were, therefore, helpless. It was not pretended that any of the proposed victims, in the instance under notice, had said or done anything, in opposition to the Rebellion, which had made them amenable to the unbridled caprices of those who were in rebellion; and it was evident that, had those proposed victims thus transgressed against the "*Associations*" or the "rec-"ommendations" or the "Resolutions" of the revolutionary authorities, the local Committee in Westchester-county, or the Provincial Congress in the City of New York, or the Committee of Safety of the last-named body, and not an improvised and self-constituted power, in another Colony, was the proper tribunal to take cognizance of such an offence. But in such a party, led by such a ruffian, only the law of the will of the stronger possessed any authority or secured any respect; and that law of "the pirate "and the banditti," unfortunately, prevailed in the instance now under notice.

The expedition evidently moved slowly, on its way to New York;[4] and, especially after it had passed the Byram-river, it undoubtedly foraged on those who were unfortunate enough to live on the line of its march. It pillaged the farm-houses; and, at Mamaroneck, it burned a small sloop which belonged to one who was assumed to have been a friend of the Government.[5] A detachment of about forty men, under a Captain Lothrop, appears to have been pushed forward to the Town of Westchester, where, on Wednesday, the twenty-second of November, it seized the person of Nathaniel Underhill, the Mayor of that Borough, and that of the Rev. Samuel Seabury, who, as we have said, was the Master of

[1] "On the 20th of this month, sixteen respectable inhabitants of this "town, in company with Captain SEARS, set out from this place, for "*East and West Chester*, in the Province of New-York, to disarm the "principal tories there, and secure the persons of Parson Seabury, "Judge Fowler, and Lord Underhill." * * * (*The Connecticut Journal*, No. 424, [*New-Haven*,] Wednesday, November 29, 1775.)

Frank Moore, in his *Diary of the American Revolution*, (i., 173–175,) published a mutilated version of that editorial article, from the original of which the above was extracted—the other portions of the latter of which will be used hereafter—and credited it to *The Pennsylvania Journal*, published in Philadelphia, on the ninth of December.

[2] In the preceding September, Lord Dunmore, then at Norfolk, in Virginia, had helped himself to the type and printing-press of John Holt, in that Town: and it was said of the thief and his confederates, "a few "spirited gentlemen in Norfolk, justly incensed at so flagrant a breach "of good order and the Constitution, and highly resenting the conduct "of Lord Dunmore and the Navy Gentry, who have now commenced "*downright Pirates and Banditti*, ordered the drum to beat to arms," etc. (*Extract from a contemporary publication*, in Force's *American Archives*, Fourth Series, iii., 817.)

Besides the entire fitness of the words to distinguish those who were guilty of such lawless doings, a precedent for the use of those otherwise strong terms in such specific connections, is afforded in the above extract, from unquestionably revolutionary authority: and we offer no apology for applying one or both of them to those, from Connecticut, on the occasion now under notice, when Lord Dunmore was far outdone, in wanton atrocity.

[3] "On their way thither" [*for East and West Chester,*] "they were "joined by the Captains Richards, Sillick, and Mead, with about 80 "men." * * * (*The Connecticut Journal*, No. 424, [NEW HAVEN] Wednesday, November 29, 1775.)

It is due to the respectable portion of the inhabitants of the Connecticut of that period, that mention should be made of the fact that no such names as those appear on the lists of Officers of Connecticut Companies, in 1775, which Mr. Hinman published in his *Historical Collections of the part sustained by Connecticut during the War of the Revolution*; and that it is very probable that these three "Captains," like that other "Captain" who led them, on that occasion, possessed no other warrant than that of "courtesy," so called, for the privilege of carrying the title.

[4] It left New Haven on Monday, the twentieth of November; but it did not reach Westchester until Wednesday, the twenty-second, and the City of New York, to which place it extended its excursion, until noon on Thursday, the twenty-third of that month.

[5] "At *Marlock* they burnt a small sloop, which was purchased by Gov-"ernment, for the purpose of carrying provisions on board the *Asia*."—(*The Connecticut Journal*, No. 424, [NEW HAVEN,] Wednesday, November 29, 1775.)

"* * * * and burnt one sloop belonging to persons friendly to gov-"ernment."—(*Governor Tryon to the Earl of Dartmouth*, No. 22. "ON "BOARD THE SHIP DUTCHESS OF GORDON NEW YORK HARBOUR, 6th Dec "1775."

a Boarding-school and Rector of the Established Church, in the same place, the former, as was subsequently seen, only because he had signed the *Declaration and Protest*, at the White Plains, in the preceding April,[1] the latter, because he was more obnoxious to those who were in rebellion, in consequence of his greater intellectual power and of his decidedly greater bravery in the assertion and maintenance of his opinions and of his Rights.[2] Having accomplished its purposes in the seizures of the persons and in the plunder of the properties of the two victims, in Westchester, the detachment permitted Mr. Seabury, if not Mr. Underhill, to send for his horse; and, then, it hastened away, on the road which connected that Town with Kingsbridge. It had not proceeded far, however, when it was met by the main body of the banditti, with whom, with characteristic cowardice, was Sears; and the entire party then returned to Eastchester, where, on its way toward New York, it had already seized the person of Jonathan Fowler, who was one of the Judges of the Superior Court of Common Pleas and Colonel of one of the Battalions of the Colonial Militia, against whom, also, it seems there was no other complaint than that he, also, had signed the *Declaration and Protest*, at the White Plains, in the preceding April.[3]

The contemporary records do not present the circumstances which attended the seizure of the Mayor of the Borough of Westchester; but it is probable they were similar to those which attended the similar seizure of Judge Fowler and that of Mr. Seabury—the banditti undoubtedly ransacked the house and examined his papers and helped themselves to such articles of his movable property as best pleased them. From Judge Fowler's house, there were carried away a beaver hat, a silver-mounted horse-whip, and two silver spoons,[4] besides the sword, gun, and pistols which formed portions of his official equipments as a Colonel in the Colonial Militia;[5] and at Mr. Seabury's, besides assaulting one of that gentleman's daughters, thrusting a bayonet at her breast and through her cap, and tearing down her hair, the marauders cut a quilt which was in the frame, rendering it useless; examined his private papers and scattered them; and carried away a small sum of money, which was in the drawer of his desk. Of course, the Boarding-school for Boys, which he had organized and established with so much labor,[6] for the better support of his family, was broken down; and the pupils, five of whom were from Jamaica and one from Montreal, the parents of four others being in Europe, besides "others from "New York and the country," were necessarily scattered, inflicting an irreparable injury to him and to his large and dependent family.[7]

When these seizures had been accomplished and after what had been stolen had been sufficiently secured, another detachment from the main body of the banditti was sent back to Horseneck [*West Greenwich, Connecticut*,] as an escort and guard of the three prisoners and of the booty;[8] while the main body, itself, numbering seventy-five mounted men, moved forward, from East Chester, toward the City of New York.[9]

Where that large body of horsemen spent the fol-

[1] See pages 72–74, ante.

[2] "At East Chester they seized Judge *Fowler*, then repaired to West "Chester and secured Seabury and Underhill."—(*The Connecticut Journal*, No. 424, [New Haven,] Wednesday, November 29, 1775.)

In his *Memorial to the General Assembly of Connecticut*, Seabury expressly stated that he was arrested by a detachment; that the main body of the party was subsequently joined, by the detachment; and that all, then, returned to East Chester.

[3] *Memorial of Samuel Seabury to the General Assembly of Connecticut*, December 20, 1775.

See, also, *The Connecticut Journal*, No. 424, [New Haven,] Wednesday, November 29, 1775; Jones's *History of New York during the Revolutionary War*, i., 66, 67; etc.

[4] *Memorial of Samuel Seabury to the General Assembly of Connecticut*, December 20, 1775.

[5] Jones's *History of New York during the Revolutionary War*, i., 67.

[6] The following advertisement, copied from *Rivington's New-York Gazetteer*, No. 97, New-York, Thursday, February 23, 1775, will clearly indicate the high character of that Colonial Westchester Boarding-school for Boys, probably the prototype of those similar institutions, in more recent days, which have made Westchester-county so widely known, in the world of Education:

"To the Public,

"SAMUEL SEABURY, *M.A.*

"*Rector of the Parish of Westchester*,

"HATH opened a School in that Town, and offers his Service to "prepare young Gentlemen for the College, the Compting-"House, or any genteel Business for which Parents or Guardians may "design them. Children who know their Letters will be admitted to "his School, and taught to read English with propriety, and to write it "with a fair Hand, and with grammatical accuracy. They will be in-"structed in Arithmetic, if required, in its utmost extent; and in the "Elements of Geometry; in Trigonometry, Navigation, Surveying, etc. "—The Latin and Greek Languages will be taught those who are in-"tended for a learned Education.

"There are already eleven Students under Mr. Seabury's Care, and as "soon as the Number of Scholars shall require it, a good Usher will be "provided: And no Care or Diligence shall be wanting to give Satisfac-"tion to those Gentlemen who shall favor him with the Education of "their Children.

"Proper attention will be paid to the young Gentlemen, that they be "kept clean and decent, and that they behave with propriety; and as "the most essential Part of Education is to qualify them to Discharge "the Duties and Offices of Life with Integrity and Virtue, particular "Care will be taken to explain to them the Principles of Morality, and "the Christian Religion, by frequent short Lectures, adapted to their "Capacity.

"Board, (Washing included) may be had, in unexceptionable Fami-"lies, at about twenty Pounds per Ann. and the Tuition will be six "Pounds, New-York Currency, and eight Shillings for Fire-wood.

"Westchester is about nineteen Miles from New York, by Land, and "about fifteen by Water; and a Water passage may be had almost "every Day, when the Weather will permit, in good safe Boats."

[7] *Memorial of Samuel Seabury to the General Assembly of Connecticut*, December 20, 1775.

[8] "Having possessed themselves of these three caitiffs, they sent them "to Connecticut under a strong guard."—(*The Connecticut Journal*, No. 424, [New Haven,] Wednesday, November 29, 1775.)

See, also, *Memorial of Samuel Seabury to the General Assembly of Connecticut*, December 20, 1775.

[9] *The Connecticut Journal*, No. 424, [New Haven,] Wednesday, November 29, 1775.

[illegible]ing night is not now known—it is not in the [illegible]ghtest degree probable that it paid its way, in whatever part of Westchester-county it billeted itself—it is very evident, however, that it was expected by the [illegible]ders of the Rebellion, in the City of New York, [illegible]nce it was met and escorted into town by Samuel Broome, John Woodward, and others of their class;[1] and it is said, also, that Alexander McDougal, Peter R. Livingston, John and Joshua Hett Smith—the latter so conspicuous, subsequently, in the interviews between General Arnold and Major André and in the evident exposure of the latter to arrest—and a number of others, their confederates if not their tools, were assembled on Hanover-square, on which the Bookstore and Printing-office of James Rivington were situated, apparently and nominally for military exercises, but really for the purpose of covering and protecting the approaching banditti, in its proposed work of devastation and robbery.[2]

The column appears to have moved from Eastchester, by way of Kingsbridge and the old Boston post-road, through what are, now, the Central Park and Madison-square and Broadway and the Bowery and Chatham-square and Chatham-street, to what is, now, Pearl-street—then known as Queen-street[3]—which was the direct route to Hanover-square, the objective point of its march. With its escort of local sympathizers, its progress was not obstructed; and, on Thursday, the twenty-third of November, at noon, when it reached the Square, it "drew up, in close "order, before the printing-office of the infamous "James Rivington,"[4] those who had already assembled there, evidently for the purpose of covering it, if not for the purpose of doing more than that, should any opposition to its purposes be manifested by any one welcoming it, as their auxiliaries and confederates.

It is said that, while the main body of the banditti remained in position, in front of the Bookstore and Printing-office of the proscribed Englishman, "a "small detachment" entered the latter, and gathered "the principal part of his types," which was placed in sacks prepared for the purpose, destroying those portions which could not be taken away, and demolishing, also, his presses and other office-material.[5]

It is said that three quarters of an hour were spent in that work of reckless destruction, without the slightest attempt by either the Municipal or the Colonial authorities, legal or revolutionary, to interfere, for the preservation of the peace or for the protection of the property of the citizen or for that of the freedom of the Press; and, consequently, after its appetite for outrage had become satisfied, taking with it the type which it had not destroyed and such articles from the Bookstore as were fancied by those who entered it,[6] the banditti mounted its horses, its music striking up the tune of *Yankee Doodle*, and its local sympathizers in the Square and around the head of the Coffee-house Slip giving it cheers which were returned, and left the City by the same route as that on which it had entered it.[7]

---

[1] *Minutes of the General Committee of the City and County of New York*, Thursday, November 23, 1775; Jones's *History of New York during the Revolutionary War*, i., 66; *Governor Tryon to the Earl of Dartmouth*, No. 22, ON BOARD THE SHIP DUTCHESS OF GORDON NEW YORK HARBOUR, 6th Decr 1775; etc.

[2] Jones's *History of New York during the Revolutionary War*, i., 66.

[3] *Manual of the Corporation of the City of New-York for 1855*, 511.

[4] "The main body, consisting of 75, then proceeded to New-York, "which they entered at noon-day on horseback, with bayonets fixed, and "in the greatest regularity, went down the main street, and drew up in "close order before the printing-office of the infamous James Riving-"ton." (*The Connecticut Journal*, No. 424, [NEW HAVEN,] Wednesday, November 29, 1775.)

See, also, *Governor Tryon to the Earl of Dartmouth*, No. 22, "ON BOARD "THE SHIP DUTCHESS OF GORDON NEW YORK HARBOUR, 6th Decr 1775"; *Petition of the General Committee of the City and County of New York to the Provincial Congress*, (*vide page 134 post*,) *the Provincial Congress of New York to the Governor of Connecticut*, "IN PROVINCIAL CONGRESS, NEW-"YORK, 12th Decr. 1775;" Jones's *History of New York during the Revolutionary War*, i., 66; etc.

[5] "A small detachment entered it," [*the printing-office*,] "and in about "three-quarters of an hour brought off the principal part of his types, "for which they offered to give an order on Lord Dunmore" [*who had previously stolen John Holt's type and press, at Norfolk*,] (*The Connecticut Journal*, No. 424, [NEW HAVEN,] Wednesday, November 29, 1775.)

They "entered his" [*Rivington's*] "house, demolished his printing "apparatus, destroyed a part and carried off the remainder of his "types."—(Jones's *History of New York during the Revolutionary War*, i., 66.)

See, also, *Governor Tryon to the Earl of Dartmouth*, No. 22, "ON "BOARD THE SHIP DUTCHESS OF GORDON NEW YORK HARBOUR, 6th Decr "1775;" etc.

[6] *Governor Tryon to the Earl of Dartmouth*, No. 22, "ON BOARD THE SHIP "DUTCHESS OF GORDON NEW YORK HARBOUR 6th Decr 1775."

[7] "They then faced and wheeled to the left, and marched out of town to "the tune of *Yankee Doodle*. A vast concourse of people assembled at "the Coffee House bridge on their leaving the ground, and gave them "three very hearty cheers."—(*The Connecticut Journal*, No. 424, [NEW HAVEN,] Wednesday, November 29, 1775.)

The *Petition of the General Committee of the City and County of New York*, laid before the Provincial Congress, on the eighth of December, 1775, presented the general facts of the outrage on James Rivington, while it also called for the protection of the City, by that body. The *despatch of Governor Tryon to the Earl of Dartmouth*, No. 22, "ON BOARD THE SHIP "DUTCHESS OF GORDON NEW YORK HARBOUR 6th Decr 1775," described the raid on Westchester-county as well as that on the City of New York, and narrated the blustering threats which were made by Sears, to return with "a more numerous body of the Connecticut Rioters and to take "away the Records of the Colony." The *letter of the Provincial Congress to the Governor of Connecticut*, "IN PROVINCIAL CONGRESS, NEW-YORK, "12th Decr., 1775," recited the outrage in Westchester-county as well as that in the City; but in such delicate terms as indicated that that body was either in sympathy with the banditti or was intimidated by those who were so. Judge Jones, in his *History of New York during the Revolutionary War*, (i., 65-68,) noticed the entire raid, saying that Sears "en-"tered the town at the head of about 200 men, well mounted," which, from the context, evidently included those who had gone out to meet the banditti. Gordon, (*History of the American Revolution*, London: 1788, ii., 121, 122,) made mention of nothing else than of the robbery of the printing-office, of which he said, "While thus employed, people col-"lected, and the street was thronged. To prevent interruption, he called "out and told them that if they attempted to oppose him, he would "order his men to fire on them; and preparation was made for doing it, "in case it should be needful. This appearance instantly cleared the "street, when Captain Sears and his party rode off in triumph, with the "booty they were pleased to take away." Dunlap, (*History of New York*, ii., Appendix, cexx,) erroneously stated that the destruction of the printing-office was effected "by the Connecticut Light Horse," on the fourth of December. Bancroft, (*History of the United States*, original edit. viii., 275.) said Sears was "vexed at his want of influence, impatient at "being overlooked, and naturally inclined to precipitate counsels;" and in *the same work*, centenary edition, v., 184, the same author stated

The progress of the banditti, through Westchester-county, on its return, was necessarily slow, since it finished, at that time, the work of pillage among the farmers of that County, which it had commenced on its outward march—it left the City of New York on Thursday, at two o'clock; and it did not reach Horse-neck, where the detachment which was guarding its first collection of plunder and its three prisoners (the fate of which, as the practise then was among that new-formed power, having been provided, meanwhile, with neither food nor shelter) had halted, until the following Monday, the twenty-seventh of November. Its progress through Connecticut appears to have been attended with the highest popular approval; many joined it, "the whole making a "very grand procession;" and, on Tuesday, the twenty-eighth of November, amidst the salutes of two cannon and the cheers of the populace, it re-entered New Haven. The procession moved through nearly every street in the Town, stopping at every corner, in order that the crowds might gaze on the victims and jeer at and insult them; and, after having quartered the latter, at their own expense, at one of the Taverns, the successful banditti, sustained by what there was of the ignorance and lawlessness of the New Haven of that period, spent the remainder of the day in "festivity and innocent mirth."[1]

The principal portion of the bitterness of the banditti appears to have been bestowed on Mr. Seabury—indeed, there was wisdom in that discrimination, since Judge Fowler and Mayor Underhill were differently constituted men, more easily intimidated and, therefore, more pliable than he, and very soon recanted and were dismissed from their confinement[2]—

that Sears "deserved a high appointment in the American Navy," which he did not receive; that he was "impatient at being overlooked," etc. Not the slightest allusion is made to the doings of the banditti in Westchester-county, in either of the editions of that much-praised work. Lossing, (*Field Book of the Revolution*, ii., 796, 797,) stated that Mr Rivington "aided by his *Royal Gazetteer*," was very influential; that he had no regard for the truth nor for "common fairness;" that Sears had gone to Connecticut "to plan schemes for the future with ardent Whigs;" that the type which was stolen from Rivington was converted into bullets; etc.; but the truth is that the *Royal Gazette* was not established until December, 1777, as he had stated on the opposite page of the *Field Book*; that Rivington published everything of news and political papers, regardless of party; that Sears had removed his family and himself to New Haven, to get out of the way of threatened danger and to pout over personal grievances; and that the printers in Connecticut were too glad to increase their limited supplies of type to convert the stolen type belonging to Rivington into bullets, for which common and far cheaper lead was better adapted. Rev. Doctor Beardsley, (*History of the Episcopal Church in Connecticut*, i., 302-305, and *Life and Correspondence of the Rt. Rev. Samuel Seabury, D.D.*, 35-47,) appropriately noticed, in detail, the dealings of the banditti with Mr. Seabury, without, however, making the slightest mention of what was done elsewhere than in Westchester-county.

In Connecticut, from that day to this, the doings of that party of ruffians have been considered only as praiseworthy. Governor Trumbull, after having snubbed General Washington by sheltering and justifying the wholesale desertion of the Connecticut troops which the latter had denounced, (Compare *General Washington's letter to Governor Trumbull*, "CAMBRIDGE, December 2, 1775," with *the reply*, "LEBANON, December "7, 1775;" that of the former, "CAMBRIDGE, December 5, 1775," with *the reply*, "LEBANON, December 9, 1775"; etc.,) waited until the following June, before he paid the slightest attention to the letter which the Provincial Congress had sent to him, in December, 1775, and then only to shelter, if not to justify, the offenders. (*Jonn. Trumbull to the Honble. Nathl. Woodhull*, "HARTFORD, June 10, 1775.") Hinman, (*Historical Collection of the part sustained by Connecticut during the War of the Revolution*, 79, 80,) included that lawless raid among the notable and praiseworthy acts of Connecticut; and the following, which is the latest specimen which has met our eye, presents, at once, the satisfaction with which respectable men, of our own day, in Connecticut, continue to regard that outrage, and the character of what is circulated, in New England, as veritable history: "Some time during the War, a paper was "published in the City of New York, by one, Rivington. This paper was "professedly and to all outward appearance devoted to the British in-"terests. It was afterwards, however, known to have aided the Amer-"icans much, and was under the control of Washington himself. The "hostile appearance of the sheet, however, deceived the Americans as "well as their enemies, and about half a dozen Greenwich men re-"solved that the press should be stopped; they stole into the City, de-"stroyed the press, and bagged the type, which they brought off with "them from the very midst of a watchful enemy. Messrs. Andrew and "Peter Mead were the principal men of the expedition. It is said that "they only of the company were able to carry the bags of type from the "printing-office to the street and throw them across the backs of their "horses. After the type was brought to Greenwich, it was totally de-"stroyed, except enough to print each of the company's names, which "the veterans kept for a long time in memory of their exploit." One might readily suppose this latest tidbit of what has currency as history, was written in China or Timbuctoo; but the curious reader may find it in an elegant and expensive *History of Fairfield County, Connecticut*, compiled under the supervision of D. Hamilton Hurd, and published by J. W. Lewis & Co., Philadelphia, in 1881. It occupies a portion of page 378 of that handsomely printed volume, and affords a fine example of the character of what is written, concerning New Englanders and their character and doings, when the pen of the writer and the patronage of the publisher are within that pretentious portion of the Union.

[1] "On their way home they disarmed all the tories that lay on their "route; and yesterday [*November* 28,] arrived here, escorted by a great "number of gentlemen from the westward, the whole making a very "grand procession. Upon their entrance into town, they were saluted "with the discharge of two cannon, and received by the inhabitants with "every mark of approbation and respect. The company divided into "two parts and concluded the day in festivity and innocent mirth. "Captain Sears returned in company with the other gentlemen, and "proposes to spend the winter here, unless publick business should re-"quire his presence in New-York.—Seabury, Underhill, and Fowler, "three of the dastardly protestors against the proceedings of the Conti-"nental Congress, and who it is believed had concerted a plan for kid-"napping Captain Sears, and conveying him on board the Asia man-of-"war, are (with the types and arms) safely lodged in this town, Where "it is expected Lord Underhill will have leisure to form the scheme of "a lucrative lottery, the tickets of which cannot be counterfeited; and "Parson Seabury sufficient time to compose sermons for the next Conti-"nental fast."—(*The Connecticut Journal*, No. 424, [NEW HAVEN,] Wednesday, November 29, 1775.)

See, also, *Seabury's Memorial to the General Assembly of Connecticut*, December 20, 1775, *at page* 136, *post*; and Jones's *History of New York during the Revolutionary War*, i., 66, 67.

[2] Although the instruments of the recantation of these two of the three victims do not appear in *The Connecticut Journal*, they were printed in Holt's *New-York Journal*, No. 1718, NEW-YORK, Thursday, December 7, 1775, and may be seen in Force's *American Archives*, IV., iii., 1768.

I.

"Whereas I, Jonathan Fowler, Esq., one of His Majesty's Judges of "the Inferior Court for the County of Westchester, in the Province of "New-York, did, some time ago, sign a Protest against the Honourable "Continental Congress, which inconsiderate conduct I am heartily sorry "for, and do hereby promise for the future not to transgress in the view "of the people of this Continent, nor in any sense to oppose the meas-"ures taken by the Continental Congress.

"I do also certify that, some time past, being at Court at the White-"Plains, I heard a person say, whom several people present believed to "be a Lieutenant or Midshipman of the *Asia*, man-of-war, that the Cap-"tain of the *Asia* intended to take Captain Sears up, and that there "would soon be delivered, gratis, from on board the man-of-war, great "quantities of Paper Money, in imitation of Continental Currency,

"he was "prevented from enjoying a free inter-"course with his friends; forbidden the visits of "some of them, though in company with his guard; "prohibited from reading prayers in the Church, and "in performing any part of Divine Service, though "invited so to do; interdicted the use of pen, ink, "and paper, except for the purpose of writing to his "family, and then it was required that his letters "should be examined and licensed" [*by the leaders of the banditti.*] "before they were sent off; though "Captain Sears condescended that he should be in-"dulged in writing a *Memorial to the Honourable* "*Assembly.* He received only one letter from his "family, and that was delivered to him open, though "brought by the post." Indeed, with characteristic bravado, and entirely conscious of his influence among those, in Connecticut, who were then controlling the Rebellion, Sears told his only remaining victim—the others having ransomed themselves from the hands of their captors with cowardly-made recantations—"that they did not intend to release him, nor to "make such a compromise with him as had been "made with Judge Fowler and Mr. Underhill, but to "keep him a prisoner, till the unhappy disputes be-"tween Great Britain and America were settled—"that, whatever he might think, what they had done "they would take upon themselves and support."[1]

At that time, and, indeed, until 1818, the Government of Connecticut, under her Charter, like that of Rhode Island, was based on the Sovereignty of the King of Great Britain; and the lawlessness of the Rebellion had not been permitted to disturb the forms and formalities of either her Executive or Legislative or Judicial Departments of Colonial Government—adroitly securing the monopoly of that Government in the hands of the comparatively few by whom it was held under the Royal Charter of 1661, no matter what the result of the Rebellion might be—and all these were being carried on, in the several long-established forms, nominally in the name of the Sovereign. Knowing these facts, Mr. Seabury is said to have applied to the Magistrates, in New Haven, for protection and redress, since he was held in captivity, in that Town, by no pretense of legal process nor by any other authority than the individual will of the ruffian, Sears, who was, at best, only a sojourner in that Colony and, subsequently, was sheltered by the Governor, on that ground; but his application found no favor before those Magistrates, notwithstanding their authority was undisputed. He then sought the interference of the local revolutionary Committee, with the same result. The Governor, also, disregarded his demand; and when the banditti who continued to hold him, a captive, in the midst of that Capital-town of the Colony, consented that he should memorialize the General Assembly of the Colony, which does not appear to have been, then, in Session,[2] no benefit to the memorialist, from the Legislature of the Colony, could have been intended.[3]

While these proceedings were in progress, in Connecticut, the revolutionary authorities, in New York, were almost equally unmindful of what was due from them, in the protection of the individual Colonists from the aggressions of their neighbors, and in the support of the autonomy of the Colony, which those from Connecticut were beginning to threaten[4]—the Colonial Government and the armed vessels which

"which would be printed with the types taken from Mr. Holt, of Vir-"ginia.

"As witness my hand:

"JONATHAN FOWLER.

"NEW-HAVEN, November 29, 1775."

II.

"Whereas I, Nathaniel Underhill, of Westchester, in the Province of "New-York, did, some time ago, sign a Protest against the Resolves of "the Honourable Continental Congress, which inconsiderate conduct I "am heartily sorry for, and do hereby promise, for the future, not to "transgress in the view of the people of this Continent, nor, in any "other, to oppose the measures taken by the Continental Congress.

"As witness my hand, in New-Haven, November 30, 1775.

"N. UNDERHILL.

"*Mayor of the Borough of Westchester.*"

[1] *Memorial of Samuel Seabury to the General Assembly of Connecticut*, December 20, 1775.

[2] We are not insensible of the fact that it is said that Mr. Seabury's *Memorial* was laid before the General Assembly, and referred to a Special Committee of seven members, of which William Samuel Johnson was the Chairman, and unto whom the Letter from the Provincial Congress of New York had been already referred, (Beardsley's *Life and Correspondence of Rt. Rev. Samuel Seabury, D.D.*, 43;) but in his recital of the circumstances, in his letter to the Venerable Society, on the twenty-ninth of December, 1776, Mr. Seabury made mention of nothing else than of his "putting in a Memorial to the General Assem-"bly," (*Ibid*, 45;) and Mr. Hinman, who was Secretary of State, with the original *Journals* before him, in his carefully-made synopsis of the doings of the General Assembly, from the opening of the May Session, 1774, until the close of the February Session 1778, stated that the Special Session of the General Assembly, which was assembled by special order of the Governor, on the fourteenth of December, 1775, closed its business, and was adjourned by Proclamation, on the same day; that the Special Committee of which Mr. Johnson was Chairman, was appointed for an entirely different purpose; and that the Session of the General Assembly which next succeeded that which was adjourned on the fourteenth of December, 1775, was not commenced until the ninth of May, 1776. (*Historical Collections of the part sustained by Connecticut in the War of the Revolution*, 198, 200.) General Peter Force, who diligently reprinted all the *Journals of the General Assembly*, in his elaborate *American Archives*, made no mention of a Session of the General Assembly, between that which was dissolved on the fourteenth of December, 1775, and the ninth of May, 1776, as stated by Hinman.

What mockery there was in that grace of the banditti, therefore, when it favored its captive with permission to memorialize an Assembly which had been dissolved, six days before the *Memorial* was written.

[3] *Memorial of Samuel Seabury to the General Assembly of Connecticut*, December 20, 1775; *Samuel Seabury to the Venerable Society*, "NEW-YORK, "December 29, 1776"; Jones's *History of New York during the Revolutionary War*, i., 67, 68.

[4] Besides the unceasing attempts to encroach on the territory of New York, and, in other ways, to invade the Rights of the Colonists, in that Colony, which Connecticut and men from Connecticut were constantly making; Isaac Sears, on the occasion now under notice, with the evident purpose of throwing all the titles of properties, in New York, and all the domestic and business relations, therein, into confusion and uncertainty, in order to make the inroads of depredators more certain of success, "intimated his design speedily to revisit this Province with a more "numerous body of the Connecticut Rioters, and to take away the "Records of the Province." (*Governor Tryon to the Earl of Dartmouth*, No. 22, "ON BOARD THE SHIP DUTCHESS OF GORDON NEW-YORK HAR-"BOUR, 6th Decr 1775.")

The declarations of Colonel Waterbury and Isaac Sears, on the same subject, subsequently, will be noticed hereafter.

occupied the harbor and commanded all the approaches to the City, by water, and by whom a large armed force could have been thrown into the City, to protect the inhabitants from such outrages as that which is now under consideration, meanwhile, remaining, apparently unconcerned, without raising a hand or firing a gun for that principal purpose of their presence in the Colony.

In the evening of the day on which the outrage on James Rivington was committed, [*Thursday, November* 23, 1775,] Lancaster Burling and Joseph Totten, members of the General Committee for the City and County of New York, offered a Resolution, in that body, citing Isaac Sears, Samuel Broome, and John Woodward to appear before it, to answer for their conduct in entering the City, on that day, with a number of horsemen, in a hostile manner, which the movers of the Resolution considered a breach of the *Association*;[1] but on the following evening, probably because it was distasteful to the greater number, Mr. Burling withdrew the Resolution,[2] rather than to see it ignominiously defeated.

Three days after the event, John Jay, with more self-respect and, certainly, with more respect for the honor of the Colony, notwithstanding he, also, appeared to take no interest in any other portion of the general subject, wrote a letter to the President of the former Provincial Congress, in which he warmly condemned the proceeding;[3] but, as has been stated, there was, then, no Provincial Congress to receive and to consider his protest.

On the fifth of December, the General Committee of the City and County of New York returned to the subject and adopted a well-written *Petition* to the Provincial Congress praying that that body would take measures to protect the inhabitants of the Colony from a renewal of such aggressions.[4]

Three days afterwards, [*December* 8, 1775,] the vigorous demand for protection, made by the local revolutionary Committee of the City of New York—the Committee of Westchester-county made no such movement, nor any other, in the matter—was presented to the Provincial Congress, by which body, after some time had been spent "in debates thereon," it was sent to a special Committee, of which John Morin Scott was the Chairman, with instructions to "report thereon with all convenient speed."[5]

Four days subsequently, [*December* 12, 1775,] a Report was made by the Committee, with a draft of a letter to be addressed to the Governor of the Colony of Connecticut, "on the subject matter of the General Committee's Petition," both of which were violently opposed by those who were most revolutionary in their inclinations. The debates were continued through two Sessions of the Congress, and various amendments were made in the letter, when it was adopted, Colonel Gilbert Drake and Stephen Ward, Deputies from Westchester-county, opposing the motion, and Colonel Lewis Graham, also a Deputy from that County, supporting it.[6]

---

[1] *Minutes of the General Committee for the City and County of New York*, "Thursday, November 23, 1775."

[2] *Minutes of the General Committee*, etc., "Friday, November 24, 1775."

[3] The following are his words, on the subject of the raid:

* * * "The New-England exploit is much talked of, and conjectures are numerous as to the part the Convention will take relative to it; some consider it as an ill compliment to the Government of the Province, and prophesy that you have too much Christian meekness to take any notice of it. For my own part, I don't approve of the feat; and I think it neither argues much wisdom or much bravery; at any rate, if it was to have been done, I wish our own people, and not strangers, had taken the liberty of doing it.

"I confess I am a little jealous of the honour of the Province, and am persuaded that its reputation can not be maintained without some little spirit being mingled with its prudence."

[4] *Minutes of the General Committee of the City and County of New York*, "Tuesday evening, December 5, 1775."

The record is in these words:

"A Draft of a Petition to the honourable the Provincial Congress for the Province of New-York, was read and is as follows, viz.:

"'To the Honourable the Provincial Congress for the Province of New-York.

"'The Petition of the General Committee for the City and County of New-York, humbly sheweth:

"'That a body of troops,* from a neighbouring Colony, did lately "'make their publick entry into the City, at noon-day, and did seize "'and carry off the types belonging to one of the publick Printers of "'this Colony, without any authority from the Continental or this Con-"'gress, your Petitioners, or any other body having power to grant "'such authority. And being apprehensive that such Incursions, "'should they be repeated, will be productive of many great and evil con-"'sequences to the Inhabitants of such place wherein they may be here-"'after made, your Petitioners do therefore conceive it highly necessary, "'in the present situation of publick affairs, as well for the sake of inter-"'nal peace and harmony of each Colony as for the maintenance of the "'general union of the Continent, now happily subsisting, and so essen-"'tial, at this juncture, that each of the associated Colonies on the Con-"'tinent should have the sole management and regulation of its publick "'matters by its Congress or Committee, unless otherwise directed by "'the honourable the Continental Congress.

"'Your Petitioners do therefore most humbly pray, that this honour-"'able House of Delegates would be pleased to take the premises into "'their consideration, and devise some expedient to prevent, for the "'future, the Inhabitants of any of the neighbouring Colonies "'coming into this, to direct the publick affairs of it, or to destroy the "'property or invade the liberty of its Inhabitants, without the direc-"'tion of the Continental or this Congress, or the Committee of Safety, "'or the Committee of the County into which such Inhabitants may "'come, or of the Continental Generals, unless there should be an Inva-"'sion made into this Colony.

"'And your Petitioners, as in duty bound, shall ever pray, etc.

"'By order of the Committee.'

"Ordered, That the same be fairly copied, and signed by the Chair-"man of this Committee, and delivered to the Chairman of the Con-"gress."

[5] *Journal of the Provincial Congress*, "Friday morning, December 8, "1775."

[6] *Journal of the Provincial Congress*, "Die Martis, 10 ho., A.M., Decem-"ber 12, 1775;" and *the same*, "Die Martis, 3 ho., P.M., Decr. 12, "1775."

The following is a copy of that very important letter:

"In Provincial Congress,
"New-York, 12th Decr., 1775.

"Sir:

"It gives us concern that we are under the necessity of addressing

* It is evident, from these words, that it was, then, supposed to have been a regular military operation: that the fact was, then, unknown, that it was only an inroad of banditti, winked at, it is true, but without any authority, legal or revolutionary: that the Committee did not even suspect that the raiders were only an organized band of robbers, composed only of the floating population of another Colony.

The Governor of Connecticut, regarding with reasonable contempt the feeble, if not the hypocritical, outpourings of such a bashful, if not such a double-faced,[1] body as the Provincial Congress of New York then was—at the very moment when it was considering the proposition to send a letter to him, on the subject of the raid which is now under notice, it was also balancing on the tight-rope of loyalty to the King and reconciliation with the Home Government, under the leadership of Thomas Smith, one of the distinguished body of political acrobats of that name[2]—made no reply whatever to its letter, until the following June, when he adroitly turned the scale against the complaining Provincial Congress, by reminding it that the leader of the banditti was a resident of the City of New York,[3] doing business in that City, and, also, a member of the complaining Provincial Congress; that he was, therefore, amenable, directly, to the Congress itself, for what he had done; and that it was not expedient, then, to call the rest of the banditti to account[4]—a conclusion which was perfectly reasonable while the complaining Congress complacently permitted the leader of the party, who was the principal offender, to go at large, within its own jurisdiction, without question concerning it. The long process of intercolonial diplomacy, on what, in this instance, would have been an interesting topic, had the parties in that diplomatic correspondence been honest and consistent, might have been productive of useful results; but they were neither consistent nor honest; and, like the greater part of other diplomacy, it consisted of little else than empty words, really meaning nothing and, really, producing nothing.[5]

While that feeble demonstration of her "independence and dignity" was being presented by the revolutionary authorities in New York, and there was no other demonstration, by either the Colonial Government or the armed force which occupied the harbor and commanded the City, the Rector of the Parish of Westchester, as has been already stated, remained in captivity, in the hands of the banditti who had seized

"you on a subject that has given great discontent to the inhabitants of "the City and County of New-York.

"We are informed by a Petition from the General Committee, that a "body of troops from your Colony lately made a public entry into this "City, at noonday, and seized and carried off the types belonging to one "of the public printers, without any authority from the Continental or "this Congress or their Committee.

"While we consider this conduct as an insult offered to this Colony, we "are disposed to attribute it to an imprudent though well-intended zeal "for the public cause; and cannot entertain the most distant thought "that your Colony will approve of the measure. It is unnecessary to "use arguments to show the impropriety of a proceeding that has a "manifest tendency to interrupt that harmony and union which, at "present, happily subsists throughout, and is so essential to the interest "of the whole Continent. It is our earnest desire that you would take "the most effectual steps to prevent any of the people of your Colony "from entering into this, for the like purposes, unless invited by our "Provincial Congress, a Committee of Safety, or the General Committee of one of our Counties, as we cannot but consider such intrusions "as an invasion of our essential rights, as a distinct Colony; and common justice obliges us to request that you will give orders that all the "types be returned to the Chairman of the General Committee of the "City and County of New-York. We beg you will not consider this requisition as an attempt to justify the man from whom the types were "taken: we are fully sensible of his demerits; but we earnestly wish "that the glory of the present contest for Liberty may not be sullied by "an attempt to restrain the Freedom of the Press.

"The same body of troops, we are informed, seized the Mayor of the "Borough of Westchester, the Rector of that Parish, and one of the "Justices of the County, and carried them to your Colony. Mr. Seabury, "we are informed, is still detained. If such should be the case, we must "entreat your friendly interposition for his immediate discharge; the "more especially as, considering his ecclesiastical character, which, perhaps, is venerated by many friends to Liberty, the severity that has "been used towards him may be subject to misconstructions prejudicial "to the common cause, and the more effectually to restrain such incursions which, if repeated, may be productive of mischief of the most serious consequence; and, as we would be exceedingly sorry to give "room for jealousies among individuals in your Colony that we are "desirous to damp the spirit of Liberty or countenance any of its "enemies among us, we propose to apply to the Continental Congress, "not by way of complaint, but for such a general regulation, on this "subject, as may as well prevent such jealousies as any future incursions by the inhabitants of either Colony into the other, for the apprehending or punishing any enemy or supposed enemy to the cause of "Liberty, without application to the Congress, the Committee of Safety, "or the Committee of the County within the jurisdiction of which such "persons shall reside, or command of the Continental Congress.

"We are, Sir, with the utmost respect and esteem,

"Your mo. obt. servts.

"By order of the Provincial Congress.

"To the Honble JONA. TRUMBULL, "NATH'L WOODHULL, *Pres'd.*

"*Gov. of the Colony of Connecticut.*"

[1] It is proper to say, in this connection, that the insincerity of the Provincial Congress was never more boldly presented than in its *Order* concerning the disposition which was to be made of the letter which it had just ordered to be written to the Governor of Connecticut, in the matter of the raid of Connecticut's ruffians—instead of ordering it to be forwarded to the Governor, it "ORDERED, That the said letter be engrossed and signed "by the President, so as to be ready to be transmitted, WHEN DIRECTED." (*Journal of the Provincial Congress*, "Die Martis, 3 ho., P. M., Decr. 12, "1775.")

Just *when* the Congress "*directed*" it to be "transmitted," is not known.

[2] Vide page 141, post.

[3] The notice of the raid which was published in *The Connecticut Journal*, already copied into this narrative, clearly indicated that Isaac Sears was only a temporary sojourner at New Haven, when he made that raid.

[4] *Governor Trumbull to the President of the Provincial Congress of New York*, "HARTFORD, June 10th, 1776."

[5] The Provincial Congress evidently called the attention of the Delegation in the Continental Congress to the subject, as it promised to do, in its letter to Governor Trumbull; and on the eleventh of January, 1776, the Delegation wrote, in reply: "We highly applaud the spirit, "and, at the same time, respectful manner in which you have supported "the dignity and independence of our Colony, and demanded reparation "on the subject of the Connecticut inroad. An interposition, so rash, "officious, and violent gave us great anxiety, as it was not only a high "insult to your authority, but had a direct tendency to confirm that fatal "spirit of jealousy and distrust of our eastern brethren which has done "so much injury to our cause, and which every wise and virtuous patriot "should study to suppress. The Government of Connecticut, we are "persuaded, will not only do you the justice which you have required, "but adopt effectual means to restrain their inhabitants from similar attempts in future. In this expectation, we shall take the liberty "to defer the application to Congress which you direct, until we are "favoured with a copy of Governor Trumbull's answer to your letter." (*Philip Livingston, James Duane, John Jay, Henry Wisner, and William Floyd to the Provincial Congress*, "PHILADELPHIA, 5th January, 1776.")

The Governor of Connecticut having, meanwhile, taken no notice whatever of the letter which the Provincial Congress had written to him, in the preceding December, on the 8th of March, 1776, the latter informed the Delegation from New York in the Continental Congress, of that fact. (*Journal of the Provincial Congress*, "Die Veneris, "10 ho., A.M., March 8, 1776;") but there seems to have been no action, on that subject, in the former body, then or at any other time.

him and carried him from his home; and he was thus held by that law-defying gang of ruffians, in one of the Capital-towns of Connecticut, in which the Legislature was, then, in session, without the slightest attempt, by the legally constituted Government of that Colony, to interfere, either for the rescue of the captive or for the vindication of the Law of the land, which had been indisputably violated by those who held him. As has been stated, the captive was not permitted to hold a free intercourse with his friends; the use of pen, ink, and paper, unless for the purpose of writing to his family, was interdicted; and his correspondence with his family was subjected to examination by his captors. As a matter of favor, however, he was permitted to memorialize the General Assembly of the Colony within which he was held in captivity, although that Assembly had been dissolved by Proclamation of the Governor, six days previously; and, because that *Memorial* is a portion of the revolutionary literature of Westchester-county, to say nothing of its importance as an authority in history, a place for it may be properly found in the text of this narrative.[1] It was in the following words:

"To the Honorable General Assembly of the "Gov. and Company of the Colony of Con-"necticut, now sitting in New Haven, in "said Colony, by special Order of his "Honor, the Governor.

"The Memorial of Samuel Seabury, Clerk, A.M., "Rector of the Parish of West Chester, in the County "of West Chester and Province of New York, humbly "showeth:—

"That on Wednesday, the 22d day of November "last, your Memorialist was seized at a house in "West Chester where he taught a grammar school, by "a company of armed men, to the number, as he "supposes, of about forty; that after being carried to "his own house and being allowed time to send for "his horse, he was forced away on the road to Kings-"bridge, but soon meeting another company of "armed men, they joined and proceeded to East "Chester.

"That a person styled Captain Lothrop ordered "your Memorialist to be seized. That after the two "companies joined, the command appeared to your "Memorialist to be in Captain Isaac Sears, and the "whole number of men to be about one hundred. "That from East Chester your Memorialist, in com-"pany with Jonathan Fowler, Esq., of East Chester, "and Nathl. Underhill, Esq., of West Chester, was "sent under a guard of about twenty armed men[2] to "Horseneck,[3] and on the Monday following was "brought to this town and carried in triumph through "a great part of it, accompanied by a large number "of men on horseback and in carriages, chiefly armed. "That the whole company arranged themselves before "the house of Captain Sears. That after firing two "cannon and huzzaing, your Memorialist was sent "under a guard of four or five men to the house of "Mrs. Lyman, where he has ever since been kept "under guard. That during this time your Memor-"ialist hath been prevented from enjoying a free inter-"course with his friends; forbidden to visit some of "them, though in company with his guard; prohibited "from reading prayers in the church, and in perform-"ing any part of divine service, though invited by "the Rev. Mr. Hubbard so to do; interdicted the use "of pen, ink, and paper, except for the purpose of "writing to his family, and then it was required that "his letters should be examined and licensed before "they were sent off; though on Friday last, Captain "Sears condescended that your Memorialist should "be indulged in writing a Memorial to this Hon. "Assembly. That your Memorialist hath received "but one letter from his family since he has been "under confinement, and that was delivered to him "open, though brought by the post.

"Your Memorialist begs leave further to represent, "that he hath heard a verbal account that one of his "daughters was abused and insulted by some of the "people when at his house on the 22d of November. "That a bayonet was thrust through her cap, and her "cap thereby tore from" [*her*] "head. That the "handkerchief about her neck was pierced by a bay-"onet, both before and behind. That a quilt in the "frame on which the daughters of your Memorialist "were at work was so cut and pierced with bayonets "as to be rendered useless. That while your Memo-"rialist was waiting for his horse, on the said 22d day "of November, the people obliged the wife of your "Memorialist to open his desk, where they examined "his papers, part of the time in presence of your "Memorialist. That he had in a drawer in the desk "three or four dollars and a few pieces of small sil-"ver. That he hath heard that only an English "shilling and three or four coppers were found in the "drawers after he was brought away. That your "Memorialist thinks this not improbable, as Jonathan "Fowler, Esq., informed him that a new beaver hat, a "silver-mounted horsewhip, and two silver spoons were "carried off from his house on said day. Mr. Meloy, "also, of this town, informed your Memorialist that

[1] A portion of this notable paper was published by Hinman, in his *Historical Collections of the part sustained by Connecticut during the War of the Revolution*, (pages 548–551.) Rev. E. E. Beardsley, D.D., in his *Life and Correspondence of the Right Reverend Samuel Seabury, D.D.*, (second Edition, 36–42,) published as nearly a complete and accurate copy of it as those who printed his book would permit him to give to his readers. It is believed that, with his kind assistance, we have the privilege of laying an entirely accurate and complete copy of the original manuscript before our readers, from the copy of that original which was furnished to him by Charles J. Hoadley, the Librarian of the State Library, at Hartford, the custodian of that paper.

[2] It will be observed that Mr. Seabury did not regard his captors as "troops" or "Light Horse" or military men, of any class: he evidently considered them as what are known as "irregulars;" and, for that reason, called them only "armed men."

[3] Horse Neck of that period is West Greenwich of this.

"he, the said Meloy, had been accused by some people of pointing a bayonet at the breast of a daughter "of your Memorialist, desiring your Memorialist to exculpate him from the charge, to which request your "Memorialist replied that he was not at his house but "at his school house when the affair was said to have "happened; but that a daughter of your Memorialist "met him as he was brought from the school house, "and told him that one of the men had pushed a "bayonet against her breast and otherwise insulted "her; and your Memorialist remembers that when "he left his house in the morning his daughter had a "cap on, but when she met him near the school "house she had none on and her hair was hanging "over her shoulders.

"Your Memorialist, also, begs leave further to "represent that after he had been eight or ten days "at New Haven, he was carried by Mr. Jonathan "Mix, to whose care he was committed, to the house "of Mr. Beers, innkeeper, in said town, where were "Captain Sears, Captain Lothrop, Mr. Brown, and "some others, whose names he did not know or does "not recollect. That several questions were asked "him, to some of which he gave the most explicit "answers, but perceiving some insidious design "against him by some of the questions, he refused to "answer any more. That Captain Sears then ob-"served to him, if he understood him right, that they "did not intend to release him, nor to make such a "compromise with him as had been made with Judge "Fowler and Mr. Underhill,[1] but to keep him a pris-"oner till the unhappy disputes between Great "Britain and America were settled. That whatever "your Memorialist might think, what they had done "they would take upon themselves and support. "That your Memorialist then asked an explicit de-"claration of the charges against him, and was told "that the charges against him were:—

"That he, your Memorialist, had entered into a "combination with six or seven others to seize Cap-"tain Sears as he was passing through the county of "West Chester, and convey him on board a man-of-"war.

"That your Memorialist had signed a Protest at the "White Plains, in the county of West Chester, "against the proceedings of the Continental Con-"gress.

"That your Memorialist had neglected to open his "church on the day of the Continental Fast.

"And that he had written pamphlets and news-"papers against the liberties of America.

"To the first and last of these charges your "Memorialist pleads not guilty, and will be ready to "vindicate his innocence, as soon as he shall be "restored to his liberty in that province to which only "he conceives himself to be amenable.[2] He considers "it a high infringement of the liberty for which the "virtuous sons of America are now nobly struggling, "to be carried by force out of one colony into "another, for the sake either of trial or imprison-

[1] Vide pages 132, 133, ante.

[2] In our early manhood, after a careful examination of all the evidence which was accessible to us, we reached the conclusions that the celebrated political tracts of "A. W. FARMER" [*a Westchester Farmer*] which were published in 1774, and which created such an intense excitement among the revolutionary faction, were written by Isaac Wilkins, of Westchester, and not by the Rev. Samuel Seabury, also of Westchester, to whom they had been generally attributed. Several years afterwards, those conclusions secured the respect and deference of one whose respect and deference, in such matters, were distinctions of which any one might have been reasonably proud, (*Historical Magazine*, New Series, iii., 9—January, 1868;) and we have not since seen the slightest reason for revising our early judgment, in that much canvassed question of authorship.

Within a few months after the publication of those notable political essays, the satirist, John Trumbull, wrote his versified version of General Gage's *Proclamation* of the twelfth of June, 1775, in which, in the following lines, the well-informed author of that well-written piece very clearly indicated the person who, at that early date, was recognized as the detested "A. W. FARMER:"

"What disappointments sad and bilkings,
"Awaited poor departing W . . . . . s;
"What wild confusion, rout and hobble, you
"Made with his farmer, Don A. W."

(Trumbull's *Origin of McFingal*, 31, 32;) and within six months after Trumbull's publication, Samuel Seabury, in that portion of his *Memorial to the General Assembly of Connecticut* which is now under notice, added his very clear, very precise, and very unequivocal testimony, on the same interesting question. With these two independent pieces of evidence before him, the reader may easily ascertain with how much of accuracy that early judgment was formed.

We are not unacquainted, also, with a paper, entitled *The Westchester Farmer*, written by D. Williams, and published in *The Magazine of American History*, viii., 117—February, 1882. It contains what purports to have been an unsigned draft of a Memorial supposed to have been addressed, or intended to have been addressed, by Samuel Seabury, several years after the occurrences now under consideration, to the Commissioners for adjusting the losses of the Loyal Refugees, in which draft of a Memorial he claimed, if the paper is not something else than what it purports to have been, to have been the SOLE author of the "A. W. "FARMER" tracts, as well as of various other tracts and publications. But we are constrained to say that, whether the paper is what it purports to have been or not, and whether it was copied and delivered to the Commissioners or not, of both of which we have grave doubts, there are evidences within itself of its entire untrustworthiness, in its recital of known facts; that we do not believe, therefore, that it was written by Samuel Seabury, carefully and deliberately, if he really wrote it; and that we need more evidence than we have yet seen, that he was capable of deliberately and understandingly telling or writing unqualified falsehoods, for any purpose, either while he was in New Haven, in 1775–6, or in London, after he had received his Doctor's degree from Oxford University, several years afterwards.

In view of the fact, if it is a fact, which Mr. Williams has copied from Boucher's *Sermons*, that a pension was granted to some other person for having done what, in this paper, was said to have been done by Seabury, it is very evident the British Government preferred to believe that Samuel Seabury was NOT the author of the "A. W. FARMER" tracts nor of the other publications named in that draft of a Memorial, referred to in Mr. William's paper; and that it acted, accordingly.

We are not insensible of the fact that a great-grandson of Samuel Seabury, in a paper which was published in *The American Quarterly Church Review*, for April, 1881, without any supporting testimony which any Bench in the country would have received as evidence, in any case, undertook the ungracious task of showing, by argument, that Samuel Seabury was not sincere, when he wrote the disclaimer which is now under notice; that his words, on the matter of his alleged authorship of the political pamphlets and newspaper articles referred to, were artfully intended to unsleal the General Assembly, beneficially to himself; and that, in fact, notwithstanding what he and others had said and written to the contrary, Samuel Seabury was really the author of the "A. W. "FARMER" tracts! We must be excused, however, for dissenting from the conclusions of this younger member of the Seabury family, and for

"ment. Must he be judged by the laws of Connecticut, to which as an inhabitant of New York he "owed no obedience? or by the laws of that colony "in which he has been near twenty years a resident? "or, if the regulations of Congress be attended to, "must he be dragged from the committee of his own "county, and from the Congress of his own province, "cut off from the intercourse of his friends, deprived "of the benefit of those evidences which may be "necessary for the vindication of his innocence, and "judged by strangers to him, to his character, and "to the circumstances of his general conduct in life?

"One great grievance justly complained of by the "people of America, and which they are now strug-"gling against, is the Act of Parliament directing "persons to be carried from America to England for "a trial. And your Memorialist is confident that the "supreme legislative authority in this colony will not "permit him to be treated in a manner so destructive "to that liberty for which they are now contending. "If your Memorialist is to be dealt with according to "law, he conceives that the laws of Connecticut, as "well as of New York, forbid the imprisonment of "his person any otherwise than according to law. If "he is to be judged according to the regulations of the "Congress, *they* have ordained the Provincial Con-"gress of New York or the Committee of the county "of West Chester, to be his judges. Neither the "laws of either colony nor the regulations of the "Congress give any countenance to the mode of "treatment which he has met with. But considered "in either light, he conceives it must appear *unjust*, "*cruel*, *arbitrary*, and *tyrannical*.[1]

"With regard to the second charge, viz.: That "your Memorialist signed a Protest against the pro-"ceedings of the Congress, he begs leave to state the "fact as it really is. The General Assembly of the "province of New York, in their sessions last winter, "determined to send a petition to the king, a "memorial to the House of Lords, and a remonstrance "to the House of Commons, upon the subject of "American grievances;[2] and the members of the "house, at least many of them, as your Memorialist "was informed, recommended it to their constituents "to be quiet till the issue of those applications should "be known. Some time in the beginning of April, as "your Memorialist thinks, the people were invited to "meet at the White Plains to choose delegates for a "Provincial Congress. Many people there assembled "were averse from the measure. They, however, gave "no other opposition to the choice of delegates than "signing a Protest. This Protest your Memorialist "signed in company with two members of the assem-"bly, and above three hundred other people.[3] Your "Memorialist had not a thought of acting against the "liberties of America. He did not conceive it to be "a crime to support the measures of the representa-"tives of the people, measures which he then hoped "and expected would have good effect by inducing a "change of conduct in regard to America. More "than eight months have now passed since your "Memorialist signed the Protest. If his crime was "of so atrocious a kind, why was he suffered to "remain so long unpunished? or why should he be "now singled out from more than three hundred, to "endure the unexampled punishment of captivity "and unlimited confinement?

"The other crime alleged against your Memorialist is "that he neglected to open his church on the day of the "Continental Fast. To this he begs leave to answer: "That he had no notice of the day appointed but "from common report: That he received no order "relative to said day either from any Congress or "committee: That he cannot think himself guilty of "neglecting or disobeying an order of Congress, "which order was never signified to him in any way:

retaining our own well-considered opinion that Samuel Seabury was nothing else than a learned, sincere, truthful, honorable, and fearless man, incapable of such dishonorable trickery as has been attributed to him. Others are at liberty, of course, to think differently.

[1] The reader of the two preceding paragraphs, in which the captive responded to the first and fourth of the charges which his captors had presented against him, cannot fail to find evidence, of the highest character, that, in his political opinions, Samuel Seabury was, at that time, as he had previously been, in exact accord with Isaac Wilkins and Frederic Philipse, also of Westchester-county; and that he was and had been in accord with the great body of Americans, believing and maintaining that the Home Government had invaded the personal and political rights of the Colonists; that the latter had just reason for complaints and opposition to the Colonial and Home Governments, because of those grievances; that the Colonists were justified in their opposition to those obnoxious measures and to those who enacted and promoted the execution of them, as far as that opposition involved no violation of the Rights of Persons or Properties nor of the Laws of the Land; and that the Continental Congress of 1774, until it passed beyond the prescribed limits of its authority, as that authority had been specifically defined by its constituent Colonies, and until it assumed the unwarranted authority of legislation, thereby closing the open door of reconciliation with the Mother Country, for the promotion of which it had been expressly and solely constituted, was worthy of the respect and support which were given to it, by nearly every one, in the Colony. In common with the great body of the Colonists, throughout the entire seaboard, he was sincere in his convictions that the Colonies were suffering from the wrongs which had been inflicted on them by the Mother Country; and he was willing to resort to all lawful means for their relief. But when the entire machinery of the party of the Opposition was seized by those who only cared for the offices which they could secure and for the promotion of only a factional struggle for the control of the political power of the Colony, he preferred to remain among the conservatives, and to act, if he acted in any political movement, with the conservative rather than with the revolutionary faction of the party of the Opposition.

Whatever he may have subsequently become, and the persecutions to which he was subjected by those of the opposite faction of the Opposition would have soured the most amiable of dispositions and have transformed those who were more opposed to the Government than he into active "friends of the Government," when this *Memorial* was written, and previously thereto, Samuel Seabury, like Isaac Wilkins and Frederic Philipse and the De Lanceys and the great body of the farmers of Westchester-county and those who were not seekers for offices and official power and official emoluments, everywhere, as far as they were politically inclined, in any direction, were unchanged, conservative members of the earlier party of the Opposition to the existing, governing Ministry, without either pretending to be or being, in the slightest degree, what were then known, distinctively, as "friends of the Government," or what have subsequently become known by the technical term, as offensive as it was distinctive, of "Tories."

[2] Vide pages 55, 56, ante.

[3] Vide pages 71-74, ante.

"That a complaint was exhibited against your "Memorialist to the Provincial Congress of New "York, by Captain Sears, soon after the neglect with "which he is charged, and that after the matter was "fully debated, the complaint was dismissed:[1] That "he conceives it to be *cruel, arbitrary*, and in the "highest degree *unjust*, after his supposed offense has "been examined before the proper tribunal, to be "dragged like a felon seventy miles from home, and "again impeached of the same crime. At this rate "of proceeding, should he be acquitted at New "Haven, he may [*be*] forced seventy miles farther, "and so on without end.

"Further your Memorialist begs leave to repre-"sent: That he has a wife and six children, to "whom he owes, both from duty and affection, pro-"tection, support, and instruction. That his family "in a great measure depend, under the providence of "God, upon his daily care for their daily bread. "That there are several families at West Chester "who depend on his advice as a physician, to which "profession he was bred. That as a clergyman he "has the care of the towns of East and West Chester. "That there is not now a clergyman of any denom-"ination nearer than nine miles from the place of "his residence, and but one within that distance "without crossing the Sound; so that in his absence "there is none to officiate to the people in any "religious service, to visit the sick, or bury the dead.

"Your Memorialist also begs leave to observe: "That in order to discharge some debts which the "necessity of his affairs formerly obliged him to con-"tract, he, about a year ago, opened a grammar "school,[2] and succeeded so far as to make it worth "one hundred pounds, York money, for the year "past. That he was in a fair way of satisfying his "creditors and freeing himself from a heavy incum-"brance. That he had five young gentlemen from "the Island of Jamaica, one from Montreal, four "children of gentlemen now in England, committed "to his care, among others from New York and the "country. That he apprehends his school to be "broken up and his scholars dispersed, probably "some of them placed at other schools, and that it "may be difficult, if not impracticable, again to "recover them. That if there should be no other "impediment, yet if the people of West Chester are to "be liable to such treatment as your Memorialist hath "lately endured, no person will be willing to trust "his children there. That in this case, your Memor-"ialist must lie entirely at the mercy of his creditors "to secure him from a jail, or must part with every-"thing he has to satisfy their just demands.

"Your Memorialist, thinking it his duty to use all "lawful and honorable means to free himself from "his present confinement, mentioned his case to the "judges of the superior court lately sitting in this "town. Those honorable gentlemen thought it a "case not proper for them to interfere in; he has, "therefore, no remedy, but in the interposition of the "Honorable House of Assembly.

"To them he looks for relief from the heavy hand "of oppression and tyranny. He hopes and expects "that they will dismiss him from his confinement, "and grant him their protection, while he passes "peaceably through the colony. He is indeed "accused of breaking the rules of the Continental "Congress. He thinks he can give a good account "of his conduct, such as would satisfy reasonable "and candid men. He is certain that nothing can "be laid to his charge so repugnant to the regula-"tions of the Congress, as the conduct of those "people who in an arbitrary and hostile manner "forced him from his house, and have kept him now "four weeks a prisoner without any means or pros-"pect of relief. He has a higher opinion of the "candor, justice, and equity of the Honorable House "of Assembly, and shall they incline to inquire more "minutely into the affair, he would be glad to ap-"pear at the bar of their house, and answer for him-"self; or to be permitted to have counsel to answer "for him; or, in such way as they in their wisdom "shall think best, to grant him relief. And your "Memorialist, as in duty bound, shall ever pray.

"SAMUEL SEABURY.

"Dated in NEW HAVEN the 20th day of Decem-"ber, 1775."

Three days after this spirited Memorial was written —there is no record that it was ever laid before a General Assembly[3]—as the brave Memorialist subse-

[1] The ruffianly leader of the banditti who seized Samuel Seabury and destroyed or carried away the property of James Rivington, had had a public controversy with the latter, and had been most ignominiously defeated, (deLancey's *Notes* on Jones's *History of New York during the Revolutionary War*, i., 561-566.) The text of the *Memorial of Samuel Seabury*, in this place, indicated that the same disreputable *habitué* of Jasper Drake's Beekman's Slip unlicensed alehouse had also had a political tilt with the Rector of St. Peter's Church, in Westchester, with a similar result. The reader may gather from those facts, without resorting to that general fact of the disappointment of Sears, in his scramble for "a high office in the American Navy," of which Bancroft has made mention, just what was the reason that that ruffian was so zealous, in his pursuit of the two who had so signally defeated him.

[2] Vide pages 128, 130, ante.

[3] We are not insensible of the fact that Hinman, in his *Historical Collections of the part sustained by Connecticut during the War of the Revolution*, (*page* 548,) stated that Samuel Seabury "brought his petition on the "20th day of December, 1776,* to the General Assembly of Connecticut, "then sitting at New Haven;" and, further, (*page* 551,) that "the peti-"tion, in the Assembly, was referred to a Joint Committee of the two "Houses, with William Samuel Johnson, Esq., as Chairman, who re-"ported that a letter had been received from the President of the New "York Congress, on the subject; and that to answer said letter, a pub-"lic hearing should be had before both Houses of said Assembly." We are not insensible, also, that Mr. Seabury addressed his *Memorial* "To "the Honorable the General Assembly * * * now sitting in New "Haven, in said Colony, by special Order of his Honor, the Governor," (*vide page* 136, *ante*.) But the *Journal of that Special Session*, called by the Governor, and sitting at New Haven, shows "the General Assembly "was adjourned by Proclamation, on the 14th day of December, 1775;" and that there was no other Session of the Assembly, from the latter

* Thus stated in that work.

quently stated, "the gang who took" [*him*] "prisoner thought proper to withdraw their guard and "let" [*him*] "return" to his desolated home.[1]

It was not pretended that either the Executive, or the Legislative, or the Judicial authorities of the Colony of Connecticut, none of whom had been disturbed by the revolutionary element within that Colony and all of whom were enabled to discharge all their legitimate functions, had made the slightest movement for the relief or for the release of the captive, who, during the preceding nearly five weeks, had been held in captivity, with the entire knowledge and acquiescence and in the presence of each of those several departments of the Colonial Government, in one of the Capital-Towns of the Colony. It was not pretended that any one of the seventeen banditti, residents of the Town of New Haven and known to all in authority, had been called to account, by any one in authority, for their flagrant violation of the Law of the land. On the contrary, it is evident that his captors had become tired, since they found that an able and courageous prisoner, such as Samuel Seabury was, was not likely to be useful to either the general cause of the Rebellion or to those who held him; and, therefore, without any official action which has been recorded, either by the official pens or by the traditional stylus of history—just as similar political prisoners, within the memory of living men, have been informally and unceremoniously ejected from places in which they had been lawlessly confined by warrant of no other *mittimus* than the naked *ipse dixit* of reckless and law-defying political demagogues possessing a revolutionary power to issue such orders—the guards which had barred the outlet from his improvised prison were removed; the doors were opened; and he was permitted to depart, without hindrance, and to return, without molestation, to his home and family.

He reached Westchester, on his return, on the second of January, 1776;[2] but his private affairs were very much disturbed;[3] his School, on which he largely depended for the payment of his debts and for the more comfortable support of his family, was broken up;[4] his present means were very limited—the expense of his month's confinement, in the hands of the banditti, had amounted to the very large sum of ten pounds sterling[5]—his papers were so much scattered that he was unable to discharge his official duties with propriety and accuracy;[6] he and his family were subjected to constant annoyances and insults;[7] his house was occupied, soon after, by a Company of Cavalry, who consumed or destroyed all the products of his Glebe, on which, to a considerable extent, his family was made dependent;[8] he was thus made entirely dependent for support on his small stipend as a Missionary of the Venerable Society; and, finally, like his friend and neighbor, Isaac Wilkins, he was compelled to seek shelter and safety in flight[9]—when a favorable opportunity was afforded, he gathered such of his effects as could be conveniently carried, and, with his wife and six children, he fled, first across the Sound, to Long Island and, subsequently, to the City of New York.[10]

Need there be any surprise that, after such an experience of what, in practice, were "the Liberties of "America," Samuel Seabury's political opinions underwent a radical change—that he ceased to be of the party of the Opposition to the Ministry then in place; and that he became, decidedly and firmly, "a friend "of the Government," in other words, an unqualified and distinctive Tory?[11]

On the fourth of December, 1775, also during the period between the dissolution of the first and the organization of the second of the series of the Provincial Congresses, the Governor of the Colony, William Tryon, from his shelter, on board the ship *Duchess of Gordon*, lying in the harbor of the City of New York, evidently and reasonably encouraged by the backwardness of the Deputies to the Provincial Congress; by the known inclination to peace, of a large majority, if not of nearly all, the Colonists; and by the countenance and expected support of sundry of the leaders of the Rebellion, addressed a letter to the Mayor of that City, Whitehead Hicks,[12]

date until the second Thursday of the following May, see the same *Historical Collections*, etc., 200.

[1] *Rev. Samuel Seabury to the Secretary of the Venerable Society*, "NEW "YORK, December 29, 1776."

[2] *Rev. Samuel Seabury to the Venerable Society*, "WESTCHESTER, Janu-"ary 13, 1776;" Beardsley's *Life and Correspondence of Rt. Rev. Samuel Seabury, D.D.*, 43.

[3] *Rev. Samuel Seabury to the Venerable Society*, "WESTCHESTER, Janu-"ary 13, 1776."

[4] Beardsley's *Life and Correspondence of Rt. Rev. Samuel Seabury, D.D.*, 48.

[5] *Rev. Samuel Seabury to the Venerable Society*, "WESTCHESTER, January "13, 1776."

[6] Ibid.

[7] *Rev. Samuel Seabury to the Venerable Society*, "NEW YORK, December "29, 1776."

[8] Beardsley's *Life and Correspondence of Rt. Rev. Samuel Seabury, D.D.*, 48.

[9] Samuel Seabury's name was on the first "List of Westchester-county "Tories," (*Historical Manuscripts*, etc.: *Miscellaneous Papers*, xxxiv., 193.) In September, 1776, after reciting the disaffection of Rev. Samuel Seabury, the Committee of Safety, five of the Westchester-county members being present, directed Colonel Joseph Drake, forthwith, to remove him from his home to the house of Colonel John Brinckerhoff, at Fishkill, to remain there till the further order of the Convention or the Committee of Safety; and that he be not permitted to leave the farm of the said Colonel Brinckerhoff, except in company with the Colonel. At the same time Colonel Van Cortlandt, John Jay, and Robert Harper were directed to ascertain what property Mr. Seabury had which might be seized and sold for the payment for his board and lodging, in his involuntary exile. (*Journal of the Committee of Safety*, "Die Mercurii, 9 ho., "A.M., September 11, 1776.")

[10] Beardsley's *Life and Correspondence of Rt. Rev. Samuel Seabury, D.D.*, 50.

[11] Beardsley's *Life and Correspondence of the Rt. Rev. Samuel Seabury, D.D.*, 48–50.

[12] *Governor Tryon to the Mayor of the City of New York*, "SHIP DUCH-"ESS OF GORDON, NEW YORK HARBOUR, 4th Dec. 1775."

This letter appeared, in print, in Gaine's *New-York Gazette: and the Weekly Mercury*, No. 1261, NEW-YORK, Monday, December 11, 1775.

enclosed in which was another letter addressed "To "THE INHABITANTS OF THE COLONY OF NEW YORK,"[1] expressive of his hope that some measure might be adopted as the basis of an accommodation between the Mother Country and the Colony. It was written in a spirit of kindness and regard for the welfare of the country, probably as a feeler, and certainly after consultation with some of the leaders of the Rebellion; and it was well-calculated to lead the revolutionary portions of the Colonists back to their duty and to peace, in which it appears to have been quite effective—"several of the Delegates" [*in the Provincial Congress*] "were favorably disposed," we are told; and there can be little doubt that by far the greater number of the Colonists, also, could their well-considered and honest preferences have been safely expressed, would have heartily concurred in the proposition.

It was not, then, generally known, but the revelations made by the publication of the records of that period have recently shown, that that letter was introductory to a movement toward a peaceful solution of the political troubles of the Colonies, which, if the letter should be well-received, the very able family of Smith, who had been among the originators and most earnest promoters of the Rebellion, and whose duplicity and hypocrisy are well known, was preparing to direct and lead. Thomas Smith, one of the brothers, was a member of the Provincial Congress, and, of course, in all the councils of the party of the Rebellion, enjoying the confidence of those who were concerned in them. Joshua Hett Smith, another of the brothers, whose unholy associations with General Benedict Arnold and Major John Andre, at a later period, are well known, was not, then, in any Committee or Congress; but, nevertheless, he was, at that time, one of the leaders of the Rebellion, out-doors, and was admitted to the inner councils of those who were its leaders. William Smith, the elder of the historical family of that period and allied to the Livingstons, by marriage, was the most influential of all those who were, at that time, engaged in the political affairs of the Colony. He had been associated with William Livingston and John Morin Scott, in the historically famous "triumvirate." He had professed to approve the usurpations of legislative authority and other questionable doings of the Continental Congress of 1774; and he is known to have been an outside adviser of the factious minority of the General Assembly, with whom and with whose inconsistency of action the reader is already acquainted. He was the life-long and confidential friend and the frequent host of General Philip Schuyler; and the correspondent, friend, and political adviser of George Clinton. He gave up his house, for the occupation of General Washington, when the latter occupied the City; and, with much ostentation, he appeared to be largely in sympathy with those, in New York and elsewhere, who were in the Rebellion. But, notwithstanding all these, William Smith adroitly avoided the placing of his name to the *General Association* of the Congress of 1774, that act which was made the political shibboleth, after the catchwords of "Rights" and "Liberty" had accomplished their purposes and a new issue, that of an implicit obedience to the powers which were, had been made by those who were leaders in the Rebellion. He was, also, at the same time that he was thus masquerading as a *confidante* and an adviser of those who were leading the Rebellion and as a sympathiser with and promoter of the Rebellion itself, a Member of the Colonial Council of the King; an intimate friend and confidential adviser of the Governor of the Colony, William Tryon—whose leanings toward the pretensions of the Livingston family were as distinctly seen as were those of the venerable Lieutenant-governor, Cadwallader Colden, toward the pretensions of the more influential De Lancey family—and a secret schemer, aiming to promote the interest of his own family by disarming the Rebellion of its strength[2] and, thereby, effecting a reconciliation with the Home Government.

* * * * * * * *

As far back as the eighth of June or eighth of July, a Report had been made by a Committee which had been previously appointed to consider the subject, provid-

[1] The following is a copy of that letter, taken from the *New-York Colonial Manuscripts*, ci., 123, in the Office of the Secretary of State, at Albany:

"TO THE INHABITANTS OF THE COLONY OF NEW YORK:

"I take this public Manner to signify to the Inhabitants of this Province, that his Majesty has been graciously pleased to grant me his "Royal Permission to withdraw from the Government; and at the same "Time to assure them of my Readiness to perform ever Service in my "Power, to promote the common Felicity. If I am excluded from "every Hope of being any Ways instrumental towards the Re-establishment of that Harmony, at present interrupted between Great Britain "and her Colonies, I expect soon to be obliged to avail myself of his "Majesty's Indulgence.

"It has given me great Pain to view the Colony committed to my "care, in such a turbulent State as not to have afforded me since my "Arrival, any Prospect of being able to take the dispassionate and "deliberate Sense of its Inhabitants, in a constitutional Manner, upon "the Resolution of Parliament for composing the present Ferments in "the Provinces; A Resolution that was intended for the Basis of an "Accommodation; and if candidly considered in a Way in which it will "be most probably successful, and treated with that Delicacy and "Decency requisite to the Cultivation of a sincere Reconciliation and "Friendship, might yet be improved for the Purpose of restoring the "general Tranquility and Security of the Empire.

"I owe it to my Affection to this Colony, to declare my wish, that "some Measure may be speedily adopted for this purpose; as I feel an "extreme Degree of Anxiety, in being Witness to the growing Calamities "of this Country, without the Power to alleviate them: Calamities "that must increase, while so many of the Inhabitants withhold their "Allegiance from their Sovereign, and their Obedience to the Parent "Country; by whose Power and Patronage they have hitherto been sustained and protected.

"WILLIAM TRYON.

"SHIP DUTCHESS OF GORDON,
"HARBOUR OF NEW YORK, 4th Dec. 1775."

[2] The strength of the Rebellion was in the union of all the disaffected Colonies; and, had he succeeded in withdrawing New York from the existing confederation, which he and all the Smiths endeavored to do, that strength would have been impaired, and, possibly, the confederation of the Colonies effectually broken.

ing "for the dissolution of this Congress and election "of a new Provincial Congress for this Colony;"[1] but, very probably, nothing was really done and determined on, concerning the subjects referred to. There was some action, in the Provincial Congress, on collateral subjects; but it was not until a much later period that that body was dissolved—on the fourth of November, either because of the absence of a quorum or for some other reason, no record of a formal adjournment having been made, the Provincial Congress ceased to exist; and the works which it had done as well as its own existence, became matters of history. Sooner or later, History will assign each to the place to which it is justly entitled.

It has been stated[2] that, as the out-come of the various labors of that body, on that subject, an Ordinance had been adopted by the Provincial Congress, on the twenty-seventh of October, providing for the Election of new Delegations to a new Provincial Congress, on the seventh of November, and for the assembling of that new Provincial Congress, on the fourteenth of that month; but there is no record of any such action, on the official *Journal* of that body; and no copy of that Ordinance has been found, notwithstanding the most diligent search and inquiry have been made. Whatever may have been the form and character of the document, it is evident, however, that such an Ordinance was really adopted and promulgated, and that, agreeably to its provisions, on the seventh of November, a meeting was held at the White Plains, for the election of Delegates from the County of Westchester, to the coming Congress.[3] It is not stated in what manner nor by whom the election was made; but it is stated that Colonel Lewis Graham, Stephen Ward, Esq., Colonel Joseph Drake, Robert Graham, Esq., John Thomas, Junior, Esq., William Paulding, Major Ebenezer Lockwood, Colonel Pierre Van Cortlandt, and Colonel Gilbert Drake[4] were elected; and that any three of these should have authority to represent Westchester-county in the coming Provincial Congress—Gouverneur Morris, James Van Cortlandt, Philip Van Cortlandt, James Holmes, and David Dayton, all of whom had been members of the preceding Congress having been dropped, and Major Ebenezer Lockwood and Colonels Pierre Van Cortlandt and Gilbert Drake sent in their stead.

The day appointed for the organization of the new Provincial Congress was the fourteenth of November; but, on that day, there was not even a respectable minority of the Delegates present, which may well be considered as indicative of the coolness with which the Rebellion was regarded by the great body of the Colonists, in New York, even at that early period; and of how little warrant there had been, in fact, for the outrages which had been committed by the preceding Congress and by its Committees, in their name.

Day by day, the handful of punctual Delegates met and adjourned. They amused themselves by dictating letters to the Committees of the faltering Counties, urging the attendance of their several Delegations, "in order that the business of the great cause "we are engaged in may be no longer delayed or "neglected."[5] Threats were made, in some instances, that "the Continental Congress" might "find "it necessary, for the public service and for the want of "a Congress, to put the Colony under a Military "Government, directed by a Major-General and an "Army, and that at the sole expense of this Colony," adding that "many Gentlemen present are apprehen-"sive" that such "would be the consequence if a Con-"gress [*were*] not speedily formed, so as to proceed to "business," etc.[6] On the first of December, the Committee of Orange-county was asked—the second request of the kind—"that you will not delay sending down your "members by next Monday morning, that the public "business may no longer suffer for the want of a repre-"sentation of your County; for such is the perilous "state of America, and this Colony in particular, that

[1] In the *Journal of the Provincial Congress*, of the sixteenth of October, it is said the Report was made "on the eighth of *July* last;" in the *Journal* of that body, of the eighteenth of October, it is said the Report was made "on the eighth of *June* last;" and in a memorandum appended to the *Journal* of that body, of the nineteenth of October, stating that the Report was "wanted," it is said, also, that it was "of the 8th "*June* last." In the *Journal of the Provincial Congress*, of neither of those days, however, does there appear the slightest mention of any such Report or of the subject of it.

[2] *Minutes of Proceedings during the recess of the Provincial Congress, by their Adjournment on the fourth of November*, 1775.

[3] The following document, copied from the original manuscript, (*Historical Manuscripts*, etc.: *Credentials of Delegates*, xxiv., 24, 67,) illustrates this subject:

"To the Honorable the Provincial Congress of the Colony of "New York.

"We the Committee for the County of Westchester do humbly certify "that at the Election of delegates to represent the said County in the "Next Provincial Congress to be held at New York the 14th instant, "which was this day held at the Court House of the said County, Colonel "*Lewis Graham*, *Stephen Ward*, Esq., Col. *Joseph Drake*, *Robert Graham*, "Esq., *John Thomas*, Junr Esq., Mr. *William Pawling*, Major *Ebenezer* "*Lockwood*, Col. *Pierre Van Cortlandt*, and Col. *Gilbert Drake*, were duly "elected agreeable to the resolves of the Provincial Congress, to repre-"sent this county until the Second Tuesday of May next; and that it "was voted by the people that any three of the said Deputies shall act "for this county. Dated the 7th day of November, 1775.

"By order of the Committee.

"Gilbert H. Drake, *Chairman*.

"A true copy from the minutes taken by

"Micah Townsend, *Clerk of the Committee*."

[4] It will be seen that eight of the nine Delegates thus elected carried titles with their names—the terms "Esq." and "Mr." at that time, having recognized places in the order of rank—and that only one of the nine, William Paulding, was low enough, in the social rank, to be a plain, untitled man.

[5] These words, taken from the letter sent to the Delegates-elect of Kings-county, on the twenty-second of November, represent the substance of those sent to the Committee of Orange-county, on the following day; to the Delegates from Richmond-county in the preceding Congress, on the twenty-fourth of November; and to the Delegates-elect and to the Committees in the several Counties of Tryon, Charlotte, Cumberland, Orange, Kings, and Duchess on the first of December. (*Minutes of the Proceedings during the Recess of the Provincial Congress, by their Adjournment on the fourth of November*, 1775.)

[6] These were sent, on the first of December, to the Committees of Tryon, Charlotte, and Cumberland-counties, respectively.

"a Convention of the Deputies is absolutely necessary, "with the utmost despatch." To these pressing words, the following threat was appended: "But if, after "such repeated applications to your County, to be in "Congress, by their Deputies, if you continue to ne-"glect a measure so necessary for your reputation and "safety, you must not complain if the Congress de-"termine upon matters relative to your County, in "common with others, although yours should, by "your inattention, be unrepresented."[1] Richmond-county was not inclined to send a Delegation;[2] and was, first, coaxed to elect a Delegation, and, finally, threatened.[3] How much more, which was not recorded, that handful of the leaders of the Rebellion, in Colonial New York, said and did, for the intimidation of those who were less zealous, in that cause, is not now known; but the careful reader will not fail to inquire, without obtaining an answer, why the Home Government failed, during that long interval of hesitation and of doubt among the greater number of the Colonists, to strengthen the Colonial Government in the maintenance of order and obedience to the Laws; why those who were not inclined to rebellion were not protected in the quiet possession of their properties and in the peaceful pursuit of their respective vocations; and why the price which would have obtained the marketable leaders of the Rebellion, for the use of the Home Government, was not paid, as the smaller and more effective investment,[4] or, if the heroic treatment of the troubles was preferred, why those leaders were not arrested and punished, as other and less distinguished violators of the peace were wont to be punished, in America and elsewhere.

On the first of December, competent Delegations appeared from the five Counties of New York, Albany, Westchester, Ulster, and Suffolk, with insufficient Delegations from Kings and Duchess, and no portions of such Delegations from Richmond, Queens, Orange, Tryon, Cumberland, Gloucester, and Charlotte-counties; and, consistently with usage and the Rules of the preceding Congress, "the Representa-"tives of a majority of the Counties not being pres-"ent," those who were present "could not proceed to "business, as a Congress."[5] On the sixth of that month, competent Delegations appeared from the five Counties of New York, Albany, Westchester, Duchess, and Suffolk, with insufficient Delegations from Kings, Ulster, and Orange-counties, and no portions, of such Delegations from the Counties of Richmond, Queens, Tryon, Cumberland, Gloucester, or Charlotte; at which time, directly in violation of the rulings, on the first of that month, they declared that "the "Deputies from a majority of the Counties appeared," —a falsehood, which, to have established its true character, needed only a reference to the *Credentials* which were filed, as their several authorizations, by the respective Delegations,—organized a Congress, and proceeded to the discharge of those duties to which they had respectively assigned themselves.[6] There were five Delegations present, on the first of December, when it was declared that "the Represen-"tatives of a majority of the Counties not being pres-"ent," those who were present "could not proceed to "business, as a Congress:" five days afterwards, when no more than five such Delegations appeared, with an elasticity of conscience and of action which was worthy of those who were present, what had been declared, under similar circumstances, at their former meeting, was entirely disregarded; and what, at that former meeting, was said to have been insufficient to have allowed the five Delegations who were then present, "to proceed to business, as a Congress," was declared, in this later meeting, to be sufficient to permit five Delegations—four of the five having been of the former five—to do what the former five "could not" do: with the authorized Delegations of

[1] *Letter to the Committee of Orange-county*, "NEW-YORK, December 1st, "1775."

[2] *Letter from Paul Micheau to Robert Benson*, "RICHMOND-COUNTY, De-"cember 1st, 1775."

[3] "The evil consequences that will attend the not having a Provincial "Congress to determine on the measures necessary to be adopted and "carried into execution, at this unhappy crisis, are more easily con-"ceived than expressed; and rest assured, Gentlemen, that the neigh "bouring Colonies will not remain inactive spectators, if you show a "disposition to depart from the Continental Union. Confusion and dis-"order, with numberless other evils, you must suppose, will attend the "want of a Congress for the government of this Colony, until a recon-"ciliation with the Mother Country can be obtained." (*Letter to the Committee of Richmond-county*, "NEW-YORK, 2d Dec. 1775.")

[4] It is very well known that the Morrises were zealous loyalists, in Europe as well as in America, until the family lost its hold on the Colonial Government, by the removal of the elder Lewis, from the office of Chief Justice of the Colony. The appointment of Thomas Hutchinson to the Bench, to which James Otis, the elder, aspired, transferred the weight and influence of the Otis family from the side of the Government to the leadership of the Opposition, in Massachusetts. Israel Putnam was too highly appraised for the Royal shambles, and so remained in the market, until, on the demand of the Livingstons, he was placed where he could do no further harm. The greater success of Benjamin Pratt, of Boston, and, subsequently, that of Daniel Horsmanden, in the race for the place of Chief Justice of the Colony of New York, when James De Lancey died, added fresh bitterness to the Morrises, in the disappointment of Robert Hunter Morris; and the disappointment of William Smith, on the same occasion, threw the Smiths into the front rank of the malcontents, in New York. Egbert Dumond, of Ulster county, is said to have become informer of Congressional secrets to Governor Tryon, provisionally, with a hankering after the Shrievalty of Ulster-county, as James Duane had communicated the secrets of the Congress of 1774, to Lieutenant-governor Colden, undoubtedly for an equivalent, present or prospective. Who supposes that Captain Gilbert Livingston, of Arnold's American Legion, and Robert G. Livingston, Junior, that Philip John Livingston, the Royal Sheriff of Duchess-county, and his brother, John W. Livingston, Captain in Fanning's King's American Regiment, were not the better exponents of the real opinions of that office-seeking family of Livingstons; and who can doubt, with the roster of subsequent office holding Livingstons before him, that much of additional influence, in favor of the Home Government, might have been secured from that family and its adherents, had that Government been as generous in the disposition of offices to members of that peculiarly office-seeking family, as the revolutionary authorities and the subsequent State Government, in New York, unquestionably were?

[5] *Minutes of the Proceedings during the recess of the Provincial Congress*, "NEW YORK, Friday, Dec. 1st, 1775."

[6] *Journal of the Provincial Congress*, "Wednesday morning, December "6th, 1775."

only five of the fourteen Counties then present, the *Journal of the Provincial Congress* bearing testimony to that fact, it will be seen and understood that the record which stated that "the Deputies from a ma-"jority of the Counties appeared," is a false record; that there was, really, no quorum present, even under the rule and usage of that revolutionary body; and that, tested by that rule and that usage, even from the convenient standpoint of rebellion, the Congress was not properly constituted and was without due revolutionary authority—of course, it possessed no other authority, in the slightest degree.[1]

What was thus called a Provincial Congress, elected Colonel Nathaniel Woodhull, of the County of Suffolk, to be its President; and John McKesson and Robert Benson, the Secretaries of the former Provincial Congress, were elected Secretaries of that.[2] It assembled, day by day, until the twenty-second of December, when it took a recess, leaving a Committee of Safety to discharge some of the duties which it had undertaken to perform.[3] That Committee, of which Colonel Pierre Van Cortlandt, of Westchester-county, was the Chairman, continued in session, until the twelfth of February, 1776, when the Provincial Congress was again assembled;[4] and that Congress continued in session, until the sixteenth of March, in that year, when it took another recess, leaving, as before, a Committee of Safety, to discharge some portions of its self-imposed duties, during its absence.[5] That Committee, of which Joseph Hallett, of the City of New York, was the Chairman, continued in session, until the 8th of May, 1776, when the Provincial Congress was again assembled—it is written that "several matters of the utmost importance, "as well to the United Colonies, in general, as to this "Colony, in particular, rendering it necessary for a "speedy meeting of the Provincial Congress of this "Colony, the Committee of Safety, therefore, or-"dered Circular Letters to be sent to all the mem-"bers, requesting their attendance, in Provincial "Congress, at New York, on the first day of this inst. "May. On that day, and every day, since, many "members attended, but not a sufficient number to "make a Congress,[6] until this afternoon" [*May 8, 1776,*][7] when a quorum was found to be present, and the business was resumed and continued until the afternoon of the thirteenth of that month, when the Congress was dissolved.[8]

During that short period of about six months, the progress of events, in America, was peculiarly remarkable.

* * * * * * * *

The entire Colony, as far as Commerce, Trade, and the Mechanic Arts were concerned, was plunged into the greatest distress:[9] the seamen were idle, in the Ports, because there was an interdiction of Commerce with foreign Ports; and commercial Non-intercourse prevailed;[10] the Mechanics and Working-men in the Cities—some of whom had been the ever-ready and noisy tools of the demagogues of faction, in the earlier days of the disturbances—were suffering, unemployed:[11] to add to

[1] John Lefferts appeared in the Congress, nominally from Kings-county; but he did not pretend to offer a *Credential*, nor any other, even the slightest, evidence that he had been appointed, by any one, to appear as a representative from Kings-county or in any other capacity, in the Provincial Congress or elsewhere.

Peter Clowes was said to have represented "Goshen Precinct in Orange-"county;" but the *Credentials* which were filed from Orange-county declared that *two* Delegates should be required to represent that County; and that only when one such Delegate should appear in the Congress from "the North side of the Mountains" [*the Highlands*] and one from the "South side" of those Highlands—Orange-county, at that time, including what, now, is Rockland-county—should that Delegation be complete and authorized to represent the County. As there was only one, instead of two, Delegates; and because those Towns which were below the Highlands were entirely without a representative, there was no Delegation from Orange-county, in the Congress.

Thomas Palmer and Moses Cantine were the only Delegates, out of the seven who had been elected, and who were present, to represent Ulster-county: but those who had elected them and given to them all the authority which it was said they possessed, had declared that *three* of those seven should be required to constitute a duly authorized Delegation from that County. The two, therefore, left Ulster-county without a competent Delegation.

[2] *Journal of the Provincial Congress*, "Wednesday morning, December "6th, 1775."

[3] *Journal of the Provincial Congress*, "Die Veneris, 9 ho., A.M., Decem-"ber 22nd, 1775."

[4] *Journal of the Provincial Congress*, "Die Lunæ, A.M., February 12th, "1776."

[5] *Journal of the Provincial Congress*, "Die Sabbati, 9 ho., A.M., March "16th, 1776."

[6] That old story of the dilatoriness of the country members, even in the face of the most pressing necessities and of the most urgent calls, certainly confirm the reports that the great body of the Colonists, especially that of the country-people, was lukewarm and indifferent, if they were not positively unfriendly, to the Rebellion. If the leaders among the disaffected, and surely no others were sent to the Provincial Congress, were as tardy, in their attendance, even when the most urgent appeals for their attendance were sent, as these were, in the preceding December and in May, 1776, how much more indifferent must those have been, who had other and legitimate demands on their time and attention, and by whom an office was neither looked for nor desired.

[7] *Journal of the Provincial Congress*, "Die Mercurii, 4 ho., P.M., May "8th, 1776."

[8] *Journal of the Provincial Congress*, "Die Lunæ, 3 ho., P.M., May 13, "1776."

There is no record of a formal adjournment; and it looks very much as if the end of this Congress was like its beginning, without a quorum.

[9] *The Committee of Safety to General Schuyler*, "IN COMMITTEE OF "SAFETY, NEW YORK, 17th Janv., 1776," and *General Schuyler's reply*, "ALBANY, January 25, 1776;" *Journal of the Committee of Safety*, "4 ho., "P.M., Feb. 10, 1776;" etc.

[10] *The action of the Continental Congress of* 1774, concerning the Commerce of the Colonies, may be seen in the *Association* which it "recom-"mended."

"We beg leave to hint, that in the present declension of Trade, the "seamen of this Port ought to be employed upon this article of service" [*batteaux-men, for the Northern Army,*] "as well as that of building "batteaux," (*Committee of Safety to General Schuyler*, "IN COMMITTEE OF "SAFETY, NEW-YORK, 17th Janv., 1776.")

[11] "We would beg leave to mention it as necessary to employ as many "of the Carpenters of this City, as possible" [*for the construction of batteaux, for the Northern Army*] "to prevent them and their families "from starving by means of the stagnation of business which is more "severely felt in this City than in any other part of the Province," (*The Committee of Safety to General Schuyler*, "IN COMMITTEE OF "SAFETY, NEW-YORK, 17th Janv., 1776.")

"I can easily conceive that it is very difficult, at New-York, for arti-"ficers to procure a subsistence for their families—the like difficulty "prevails here," (*General Schuyler to the Committee of Safety*, "ALBANY "January 25, 1776.")

their troubles, the troops from Connecticut, who had been unnecessarily brought to the City of New York —" the movement seemed to have for its end to coerce "rather than to defend New York[1]"—who were unemployed, endeavored to make additions to their military pay, by underbidding the local mechanics, for work to be done, in that City:[2] and the Provincial Congress was compelled to seek employment, for both classes, elsewhere;[3] to establish manufactories for the employment of them;[4] and to supply provisions and firewood, to prevent their families from starving or perishing from the cold.[5] As many as could do so, said to be one-half of the population, abandoned the City of New York, with their families, to find safety and employment and charity, elsewhere;[6] and many, driven by necessity[7] and the neglect of the Government to protect them,[8] as well as for the promised pay in what was circulated as money,[9] were led to enlist in the short-term levies which then constituted the Continental Army, carrying into that service no greater sympathy for the Rebellion than they had previously possessed, and discharging the duties which were thus imposed on them, with perfect unconcern and with no greater animus than was produced by the expectation of receiving the stipulated payment for the services which were promised. Indeed, the extent and character of the sympathy with the Rebellion, as a matter of principle, which prevailed among the Colonists, generally, may be seen, very clearly defined, in their hesitation to take the field in support of it, even where no enemy was and where none was expected,[10] and in their precision of movements, homeward, when the terms of service of those who had been induced to enlist had expired. There appears to have been a foundation in fact for what Governor Tryon wrote to the Home Government, that "was it not from the awe of the inhabit-"ants of the neighboring Colonies and the controul-"ing influence of the Continental Congress I am per-"suaded there would be an immediate End, in this "province, to all Committees and Congresses."[11]

As the period of time which is now under review [*November* 4, 1775, *until May* 14, 1776,] included the later Autumn, the Winter, and the Spring, the farmers of Westchester-county, as far as they were permitted to do so, undoubtedly pursued their usual vocations, with their usual diligence and quietness—they certainly harvested their various agricultural productions, and marketed the surplus of their crops,[12]

See, also, the *Memorial of the Vestry of the City of New York to the Provincial Congress*, "May 30, 1776;" etc.

[1] Bancroft's *History of the United States*, original edition, viii., 278; *the same*, centenary edition, v., 185.

[2] "The Regiment here, from Connecticut, can turn out many Carpen-"ters, who consent to work upon much more reasonable terms than the "artificers of this City. It would, I imagine, be worth while to pro-"vide, if possible, a sufficient number of tools: when the present work "is done, these tools cannot be considered an idle purchase: they will "always be useful," (*General Charles Lee to the Provincial Congress*, "NEW-YORK, February 22, 1776.")

Already provided with quarters, rations, and pay, as soldiers, and without tools, these men could well afford to underbid the local Mechanics, whose houserents, food, and other expences, including their expensive tools, must be provided for, by themselves. But how dreary the times must have been, even in Connecticut, when her Artisans, were compelled to go into the Army, in order to gain their needed shelter and their daily bread.

[3] The *Committee of Safety to General Schuyler*, "IN COMMITTEE, NEW-"YORK, 17th Jan'y., 1776."

[4] *Journal of the Committee of Safety*, "Die Mercurii, 10 ho., A.M., "Jany. 24, 1776;" *the same*, "Die Sabbati, 3 ho., P.M., Feby. 3, 1776;" *the same*, "Die Veneris, 10 ho., A.M., Feb. 9, 1776;" *Journal of the Provincial Congress*, "Die Veneris, 4 ho., P.M., March 8, 1776."

[5] *Journal of the Committee of Safety*, "Die Sabbati, 3 ho., P.M., Feby. 3, "1776;" *the same*, "Die Veneris, 10 ho., A.M., Feb. 9, 1776;" *Journal of the Provincial Congress*, "Die Veneris, 4 ho., P.M., March 8, 1776."

Monies were also "advanced to the distressed wives and friends of sun-"dry soldiers, now in Canada, in the service of the united Colonies," (*Journal of the Provincial Congress*, "Die Veneris, 4 ho., P.M., March 8, 1776.")

[6] "The Inhabitants of this City are much alarmed at various confident "advises of your destination, with a considerable body of forces, for "active service, here. * * * We should not have troubled you with "this application, had it not been to procure such information from you "as may enable us, in a prudent use of it, to allay the fears of our in-"habitants, who, at this inclement season of the year, will continue, as "they have already begun, to remove their women and children, and "which, if continued, may occasion hundreds to perish, for want of "shelter," (*The Committee of Safety to General Charles Lee*, "IN COMMIT-"TEE OF SAFETY, NEW-YORK, 21st Jany, 1776.")

"This City is in Terror and confusion: One half of its inhabitants "have withdrawn with their effects, hundreds without the means to "support their families," (*Governor Tryon to the Earl of Dartmouth*, "SHIP DUTCHESS OF GORDON OFF NEW YORK 8th Febr 1776.")

See, also, the *Order of the Provincial Congress to the male Refugees, to return to the City—Journal of the Provincial Congress*, "Die Veneris, 10 "ho., A.M., May 10, 1776;" *Memorial of the Vestry of the City to the Provincial Congress*, May 30, 1776; etc.

[7] *William Smith, Chairman, to the Committee of Safety*, "SUFFOLK-"COUNTY, Jany 24, 1776;"

[8] *Governor Tryon to the Earl of Dartmouth*, No. 22, "ON BOARD THE "SHIP DUTCHESS OF GORDON NEW YORK HARBOUR, 6th Decr. 1775;" *the same*, No. 25, "ON BOARD THE SHIP DUTCHESS OF GORDON NEW YORK "HARBOUR, 3d Jnry 1776;" etc.

[9] "With many, the principal inducement to enlist arises from the "hopes of Cash."—*Abraham Yates, Junior, Chairman, to the Committee of Safety*, "ALBANY COMMITTEE CHAMBER, 11th April, 1776."

[10] In Orange-county, "none but the lowerclass of mankind will enlist; "and these were conceived not to be the men to be depended on," (*Elihu Marvin, Chairman, to the Provincial Congress*, "IN COUNTY COM-"MITTEE, OXFORD, Feb. 15, 1776.") In Duchess-county, enlistments could be made only on the stipulation that the men thus enlisted should not be required to do service outside of the Colony of New York. (*Zephaniah Platt, Chairman, to the Provincial Congress*, "POUGHKEEPSIE, Feb. 9, "1776.") In Albany-county, the recruiting-officers "found great diffi-"culties for want of money," (*The Albany Committee to the Committee of Safety*, "ALBANY, 2 April, 1776.") The enlistments were so few in number, in Queens-county, that the recruiting-officers abandoned the undertaking. (*Journal of the Committee of Safety*, "Die Mercurii, 10 ho., "A.M., May 8, 1776.") In the City of New York, the success was so small that the recruiting-officers were dismissed, "with great re-"luctance," and their several recruits consolidated. (*Journal of the Provincial Congress*, "Die Jovis, 9 ho., A.M., May 9, 1776.")

[11] *Governor Tryon to the Earl of Dartmouth*, No. 22, "ON BOARD THE "SHIP DUTCHESS OF GORDON NEW YORK HARBOUR, 6th Decr., 1776."

[12] *Journal of the Provincial Congress*, "Die Jovis, 3 ho., P.M., December "14, 1775;" *the same*, "Die Veneris, 10 ho., A.M., Decr. 15, 1775;" *the same*, "Die Mercurii, 10 ho., A.M., Feb. 21, 1776;" *the same*, "Die "Lunæ, 3 ho., P.M., March 4, 1776;" *the same*, "Die Mercurii, 10 ho., "A.M., March 13, 1776;" *Journal of the Committee of Safety*, "4 ho., "P.M., Feb. 10, 1776;" *the same*, "Die Lunæ, 10 ho., A.M.," and "4 "ho., P.M.," "March 18, 1776;" *the same*, "Die Mercurii, 4 ho., P.M., "April 17, 1776;" etc.

The great quantities of Wheat, Flour, fresh and salted Beef and Pork, Hams, smoked Beef, Tallow, Lard, Poultry, and other products of the farms in Westchester-county, which, notwithstanding the disturbances which the farmers sustained, were marketed, exclusively of the supplies sent on the multitude of Market-sloops to the City of New York, during

sometimes in the neighboring City; sometimes for the uses of distant communities, who sent there, for supplies; sometimes for the uses of the Armies, in the field; and, whenever an opportunity was afforded, to the men-of-war, in the harbor. The local Committees, sometimes, consequentially assumed to interrupt their traffic;[1] and the Committee of Safety, in order to prevent "sundry persons from Connecticut" from purchasing, for the evident purpose of forestalling the market, "requested the Committee of the County "of Westchester to take effectual means to prevent "the sale and transportation of any barrelled Beef "or Pork out of Westchester-county, to any person or "persons residing out of this Colony, or for the use of "any person or persons residing out of this Colony, "until the further order of the Provincial Congress "or of the Committee of Safety of this Colony;"[2] but, nevertheless, the fertility of the County and the patient industry of the greater number of those who lived therein were known and utilized, throughout the entire seaboard.

The same local terrorism which had prevailed, throughout the County, under the auspices of the former Provincial Congress, was continued, with the sanction of this;[3] numbers of the inhabitants of the County were seized, only on information secretly conveyed by unseen accusers, and cast into prison, without a hearing;[4] and some of them were severely treated, while they were prisoners.[5] They were plundered of their Arms, again and again, sometimes by Connecticut-men called in by the County Committee[6] or by the brutal General Charles Lee,[7] and sometimes by orders from the Provincial Congress or its Committee of Safety;[8] levies were made on her Militia, for the construction of the defensive works in the City of New York;[9] and two Companies of the new Regiments in the New-York Line of the Continental Army were assigned to be raised in Westchester-county.[10] It is also noteworthy, as a portion of the history of that period, that Westchester-county afforded the first evidence of the alteration of a Provincial Bill of Credit—one of the last emission, for five dollars, having been altered so that it appeared to have been one of ten dollars.[11]

The opening of the new year—the exact date does not appear, if it was ever definitely known—witnessed a transaction by which the lower portion of the County of Westchester, especially the Towns of Mamaroneck, Eastchester, Westchester, and Yonkers, was greatly disturbed; and yet it was an occurrence

---

the period now under examination, prove, beyond a question, and apart from every other consideration, how short sighted the leaders of the Rebellion were, when, through the violence of their lawlessness, they impaired the productiveness of so fruitful a source of supplies, both for the City and for their Armies.

[1] See pages 149, 150, post.

[2] Vide pages 150, 151, post.

[3] William Sutton, Esq., of Mamaroneck, appeared before the Congress, personally, and informed that body that he had been obliged, for fear of injuries, to leave his home; and requested protection to return to his house, and to occupy it. He is understood to have been the tenant occupying what is known as De Lancey's Neck, (*Journal of the Provincial Congress*, "Die Veneris, 10 ho., A.M., Decr. 15, 1775;" *Information received, personally, from Edward F. de Lancey, Esq., one of the present owners of De Lancey's Neck.*)

Thomas Merritt was arrested and taken before the Committee of Safety, in the City of New York, "on information of persons from "Westchester-county, that he had declared he had seen people casting "great quantities of Bullets, to kill the Whigs; and that he knew "where great quantities of those Bullets were"—a trumped-up charge, which was so entirely transparent that, after his accusers and their witnesses had been examined by the Committee of Safety, whose fondness of persecution was known to all, Merritt was promptly discharged.

These may serve as specimens of the whole number.

[4] Benjamin Hunt and —— Oakley, of Eastchester, were arrested because they had taken some Sheep, Pigs, and Poultry, to Brooklyn, said to have been for the *Asia*. William Weyman was arrested for having assisted in taking some produce to the *Asia*. Dr. Azor Betts, of ——, was arrested for violent words of denunciation, when the Congress arbitrarily broke down his business, as an inoculator for the Small-pox, and deprived him of the means of support for his family. Godfrey Haines, Bartholomew Haines, Isaac Gedney, and —— Palmer, all of them of Rye or Mamaroneck, are already known to the reader, in the sad story of the Sloop *Polly and Ann*, (page 119, *ante*;) and James and William Lounsberry; Isaac, John, and Joshua Gedney; John Fowler; Isaac and Peter Valentine; Isaac, Joseph, and Joshua Purdy; William Armstrong; William Sutton; John Flood; James, John, Thomas, and William Haines; and Joshua Burrell, besides several others, were arrested in connection with spiking of the Cannon, near Kingsbridge, of which more will be seen, hereafter, (*pages* 147, 148, *post.*)

[5] Doctor Azor Betts, Godfrey Haines, William Lounsberry, Joshua Gedney, Joseph Purdy, Joshua Burrell, and Thomas Haines were among those who were manacled and otherwise treated with great inhumanity.

[6] See pages 112, 113, 114, 123, ante.

[7] *Colonel Samuel Drake to the Provincial Congress*, "NEW-YORK, Feby. "16, 1776;" *Journal of the Provincial Congress*, "Die Veneris, 3 ho., "P.M., Feb. 16, 1776;" *the same*, "Die Sabbati, 10 ho., A.M., Feb. 17, "1776;" *the same*, "Die Veneris, 10 ho., A.M., Feby. 23, 1776."

Colonel Waterbury, who accompanied General Lee, through Westchester-county, acknowledged his possession of thirty Guns, two pairs of Holsters, nine Cutlasses, and three Pistols—how many more he had seized, and retained or sent back into Connecticut, are now unknown; and no record was taken of the names of those who had been thus plundered. They must have been taken, however, on the line of march of his Regiment, between the Sawpits and Kingsbridge; and there was not the slightest shadow of even revolutionary authority for the seizure, except the law of the stronger and that of thieves.

[8] See pages 112, 121, 122, ante.

[9] "RESOLVED AND ORDERED, That Colonel Joseph Drake and Colonel "Thomas Thomas, of Westchester-county, do draft out of their Regiments "two hundred men, in the following proportions, to wit: Two Compa-"nies of sixty-five Privates each, besides the Captains and other inferior "Officers, out of Colonel Joseph Drake's Regiment; and one Company "of sixty-five Privates, with the Captain and other inferior officers, in "Colonel Thomas's Regiment, and as many more men out of those two "Regiments as will turn out, volunteers for that service, to be imme-"diately sent to the City of New York, armed and accoutred in the "best manner possible, and to be joined to Colonel Samuel Drake's "Regiment," [*of Westchester county Minute men* (pages 108, 109, ante) *which was then in the City*] "and to receive the same pay and provisions as the "other Continental forces in this Colony." (*Journal of the Provincial Congress*, "Die Jovis, 4 ho., P.M., March 14, 1776.")

Colonel Samuel Drake's Regiment, referred to in this Order, was the skeleton Regiment of Westchester-county Minute-men, which was then in the Continental Service, and posted at Hoern's Hook, on the Island of Manhattan, at the mouth of the Harlem-river, and opposite to Hellgate, where was one of the passes to Long Island.

We have not found any record of the three Companies which were thus drawn from Westchester-county, if they were drawn.

[10] *Journal of the Provincial Congress*, "Die Solis, 10 ho., A.M., Feb. 18, "1776."

[11] *Journal of the Committee of Safety*, "Die Veneris, A.M., April 19, "1776;" *The Committee of Safety to the Committee of Westchester-county*, "IN COMMITTEE OF SAFETY, NEW YORK, April 19, 1776."

which might have been certainly foreseen and easily prevented, had those who were immediately concerned in preventing it possessed the foresight and caution which are usually attributed to intelligent men.

We have already noticed the fact that, at the beginning of the active revolutionary movements which followed the receipt of intelligence that General Gage had unwisely commenced active military operations in the field, many of the Cannon which belonged to private individuals, in the City of New York, were drawn to Kingsbridge;[1] and, subsequently, as the political feeling became more intense, every gun in the City, no matter how useless for any other purpose than for old metal it might have been, was ordered to the same place.[2]

It is not clear what good was expected to be derived from those movements of the guns; but it is very clear that, before the close of the year 1775, between three and four hundred Cannon, of all calibres, grades, and conditions—some of them good and serviceable; others, less valuable and less useful; the greater number, honeycombed and worthless, unless for old iron; and all of them, unmounted and without carriages—were accumulated in three large gatherings, one, of about fifty guns, being at "John Williams's,"[3] the Williams-bridge of the present day; one, "at or near Kingsbridge;" and the third, or larger, parcel within two hundred and fifty yards of Isaac Valentine's house, the Valentine's-hill of that period, as well as of this.[4] They were entirely unguarded; and it is very evident that they were lying side by side, presenting an apparently formidable array, notwithstanding their actually existing harmlessness.

In view of the seeming importance of that imposing park of artillery and of the entire absence of the slightest care for its safety—in retaliation, also, it may have been, for insults offered and wrongs and injuries inflicted—somebody, early in January, 1776, effectually spiked all the guns and plugged many of them with large stones forced into them, and escaped without having been discovered. The exploit was soon made known, however; and, as may be reasonably supposed, not only Westchester-county, but the Committee of Safety, in the City of New York, the Provincial Congress having taken a recess on the twenty-second of December preceding, was thrown into the greatest excitement.

The local Committee of the County of Westchester, amply endowed, by its own lawless zeal and by the equally lawless grace of the Provincial Congress, with entire authority to arrest anybody and everybody on whom its whims or its animosities might rest, very promptly exercised its ill-founded prerogatives; and a large number of the residents of the three Towns of Westchester, Eastchester, and Mamaroneck, and some of those of Yonkers, was seized, and carried before it, and examined. Many of these were evidently discharged, because nothing was shown to sustain the suspicions or antipathies which had prompted those who had seized them; but there were others, a considerable number, who were filtered out from the great mass of the suspected, because of their seeming or construed connection with the spiking of the guns, and sent down to the City of New York, to be disposed of, by the generally relentless Committee of Safety, agreeably to the dictates of its stern, imperious will. Among those who were thus selected to face the ordeal of that Committee, in which the great professional experience of John Morin Scott was combined with the savage coldness of Alexander McDougal and John Brasher, were John Fowler, Peter Valentine, William Lounsberry, James Lounsberry, Joseph Purdy, William Armstrong, William Sutton, John Flood, Isaac Purdy, John Gedney, John Haines, Joshua Gedney, Josiah Burrell, William Haines, James Haines, Junior, Thomas Haines, Isaac Gedney, Isaac Valentine, William Dicken, Isaac Valentine, Junior, and Cornelius McCartney—the latter a schoolmaster, in Yonkers—and several of these were subjected to great hardships and cruelty, in the confinement to which they were subjected.[5]

On the thirty-first of January, 1776, the Committee of Safety directed Jacamiah Allen to remove those of the guns which were near Kingsbridge, as well as those which were near John Williams's, "to the "larger parcel at Valentine's, so as to have them all "brought together, for the greater convenience of "guarding them and drilling out the spikes;" and, at the same time, the Committee agreed to give Allen twenty shillings apiece for clearing and unspiking the whole of the guns and for removing those at Williams's; but those at Kingsbridge were to be removed, at the expense of the Committee.[6]

[1] Vide pages 75, 98, ante.

[2] "While this immaculate General" [*Charles Lee*,] "had the command "in New York, about 200 pieces of heavy cannon which were mounted "in Fort George and upon the Battery, were forcibly taken away by "his orders, and lodged upon the Common," [*the Park*,] "facing his "Quarters. But, lest upon the arrival of the British Army, they "should be retaken, he ordered them to be carried up to King's Bridge, "about 14 miles from New York. The persons employed in this service "wanting horses, applied to the General to supply the defect. An hon-"est, a virtuous man, and a Christian, will shudder at the answer: "'Chain 20 damned Tories to each gun, and let them draw them out "'and be cursed. It is a proper employment for such villains, and a "'punishment they deserve for their eternal loyalty they so much "'boast of,'" (Jones's *History of New York, during the Revolutionary War*, i., 82, 83.)

"I counted two hundred and eighty pieces of Cannon, from twenty-"four to three pounders, at Kingsbridge, which the Committee had se-"cured for the use of the Colonies," (*Doctor Benjamin Church's treasonable letter, intercepted in July*, 1775.)

[3] *Stephen Ward to the Provincial Congress*, "March 6, 1776."

[4] *Journal of the Committee of Safety*, "Die Mercurii, 10 ho., A.M., "Jany. 31, 1776."

[5] There are so many entries, in the *Journal of the Committee of Safety*, concerning the spiking of the guns and those who were supposed to have been interested in the transaction, that we cannot pretend to refer to them, separately. The reader is referred to the body of the *Journal*, during January and February, 1776.

See, also, the *Journal of the Provincial Congress*, during March, 1776; etc.

[6] *Journal of the Committee of Safety*, "Die Mercurii, 10 ho., A.M., "Jany. 31, 1775."

On the twenty-second of January, one of the Independent Companies of the City of New York,[1] probably "THE BROWN BUFFS," commanded by Captain Jonathan Blake,[2] was ordered into the service of the Colony, for the protection of the guns; but a draft was subsequently made from the Minute-men of the County, to discharge that service,[3] a Captain, a Lieutenant, two Sergeants, a Corporal, fourteen privates, a Guardhouse, and all the surroundings of a permanent outpost having been provided for that easy purpose.[4] It might have been expected that that favored party of White Plains Minute-men would very soon excite feelings of envy among those, surrounding its position, who were not enjoying the feast of fat things which it had secured; and it was so—David Barclay, recommended by Stephen Ward, the latter a Tavern-keeper, near where Tuckahoe is, and a deputy in the Provincial Congress,[5] applied for the job of guarding the guns, offering to do so for thirteen pounds per week, which was less than one half the amount which had been expended on the skeleton Company of Minute-men who had previously discharged that duty;[6] and the offer was promptly accepted.[7] Jacamiah Allen, who was drilling the spikes from the guns, appears, however, to have been unwilling that any others should poach on his manor; and, very promptly, he underbid Barclay, offering to do the same guard-duty which Varian and Barclay had successively done, the former at a cost of more than twenty-six pounds and the latter at thirteen, for only six pounds, ten shillings per week; and, of course, Barclay was superseded and the coveted job was given to the last comer.[8] Very reasonably, Barclay complained to the Congress, and made a counter-offer which was more favorable than the offer on which Allen had been employed; and, of course, the latter was ousted, leaving him in possession[9]—an illustration of what material the new-created controlling power, ("the Ring," if the reader pleases,) in Westchester-county, in 1776, was composed; and in what the "patriotism" of that controlling power consisted.

In the latter part of January, 1776, burning with anxiety to be at the head of a separate command, away from General Washington, and availing himself of the rumor that a heavy military force had been sent from Boston, probably to New York,[10] the infamous Charles Lee, who was, then, second in command of the Continental Army and in the zenith of his evanescent fame, induced the Commander-in-chief[11] to despatch him, from Boston, to the latter City, "with "such volunteers as he" [*could*] "quickly assemble, "on his march, in order to put the City of New York "in the best posture of defense the season and circum-"stances will admit of."[12]

In the prosecution of the duties to which General Lee had been thus assigned—in his enlistment of men into the service of the Continent; in his appointment of the ruffian, Isaac Sears, to a high military office; in the barbarities inflicted on the inhabitants of Queens-county, by his authorized representative, Sears; in his haughty disregard of the local authorities, legal or revolutionary, in New York; and in his personal and official intercourse with those authorities and with the inhabitants of the City—the *Instructions* which General Washington had given to him, as well as the superior enactments of the Continental Congress and his own knowledge of the proprieties of intercourse between individuals and of the character of obligations in business relations, were entirely disregarded; and he permitted himself to be controlled, instead, by his own vile and ill-controlled passions and by the promptings of those, as ill-constituted as himself, who were gathered around him and who pandered to his vanity and his malignancy, for the promotion of their own evil purposes. It is not within the purposes of this publication, however, to take more than a passing notice

[1] *The Committee of Safety to Lieutenant-colonel Graham*, "IN COMMIT-"TEE OF SAFETY, NEW-YORK, Jany. 22, 1776."

[2] Compare Captain Jonathan Blake's letter to the Committee of Safety, "HEAD QUARTERS IN WESTCHESTER, Jany. 31, 1776," with the *Roster of Colonel Malcom's Regiment,—Historical Manuscripts relating to the War of the Revolution*, in the Secretary of State's Office, Albany: *Military Returns*, xxvii., 1.

[3] *The Committee of Safety to Lieutenant-colonel Graham*, "IN COMMIT-"TEE OF SAFETY, NEW YORK, Jany. 22, 1776."

[4] "I hereby acquaint you that I have taken an account from Capt. "Varian what the expense of guarding the guns at Valentine's and "Williams' will be, this week, viz.: 1 Capt., 1 Lieut., 2 Sergeants, 1 "Corporal, and 14 Privates. 6 of the above men board at 10s. per "week, and the others draw provisions from the Commissary, with a "Guard room and firewood, at £3. per week, besides items, making in "the whole about £26., and last week it was considerably more." (*Stephen Ward to the Provincial Congress*, "March 5, 1776.")

It will be remembered that James Varian, the favored commander of the Guard, in this instance, with eighteen others, had been constituted a full-fledged Company of Westchester-county Minute-men, on the fourteenth of February preceding (*vide pages* 108, 109, *ante*;) and it will be seen, from that letter which has been quoted, how soon and in what manner those nineteen Westchester-county "patriots" reached the sweets to which they had aspired—five held offices of greater or less dignity, while the fourteen who held no offices enjoyed the comforts of drawing their support from the Commissary or from the Treasury of the Provincial Congress, in addition to the pay of soldiers and what, by hook or by crook, they could pick up, in the neighborhood of their quarters.

This was only a moderate specimen of what constituted the greater portion of the "patriotism" of the Westchester-county revolutionists, at that period.

[5] *Stephen Ward to the Provincial Congress*, "March 5, 1776."

[6] Ibid.

[7] *Journal of the Provincial Congress*, "Die Mercurii, 4 ho., P.M., March "6, 1776."

[8] *Journal of the Committee of Safety*, "Die Lunæ, 4 ho., P.M., March "18, 1776;" and *the same*, "Die Martis, 4 ho., P.M., March 19, 1776."

[9] *Journal of the Committee of Safety*, "Die Sabbati, A.M., March 23, "1776."

[10] *General Washington to the President of Congress*, "CAMBRIDGE, 4 Janu-"ary, 1776;" *the same*, "Cambridge, 11 January, 1776;" *General Washington's Instructions to General Lee*, "HEAD-QUARTERS, CAMBRIDGE, 8 Jan-"uary, 1776."

[11] General Washington's letter to John Adams, "CAMBRIDGE, 7 Janu-"ary, 1776," clearly indicated that General Lee operated on the Commander-in-chief through John Adams, who was, then, in Massachusetts.

[12] *General Washington to the Committee of Safety*, "CAMBRIDGE, Janu-"ary 8, 1776."

See, also, *General Washington's Instructions to General Lee*, "HEAD-"QUARTERS, CAMBRIDGE, 8 January, 1776."

any of these transactions of that early military power, in Queens-county or in the City of New York; but those outrages which were inflicted by his authority, on the farmers of Westchester-county, while he was marching through the County, on his way to New York, may be noticed, in its pages—in his progress over the well-known Post-road, between the Byram-river and Kingsbridge, the same line of march which had been traversed by Sears and his banditti, a few weeks previously, he appears to have regarded himself as the legitimate possessor of despotic powers, while those among whom he was, were considered as only base creatures who were absolutely subject to his unbridled caprices and to the most extravagant exactions of those who surrounded him. Notwithstanding, within the preceding six or seven weeks, the farmers who lived along or near the line of the Post-road had been visited by Sears and his gang of Connecticut banditti, both on their way to the City of New York and on their return, thence, to Connecticut, by whom, on each occasion, they had been ruthlessly plundered,[1] they were again visited, during that march of Connecticut-men, under General Lee, by that new detachment of New England freebooters, and robbed, to the full extent of the hungry desires of their brutal visitors. Indeed, notwithstanding the recent visitation of his ruffianly countrymen to each of these peaceful families and the reckless depredations of those cowardly banditti, Colonel Waterbury, who commanded the Regiment whom General Lee had mustered into the Continental service—himself, as was subsequently seen and heard, in the City of New York, as fine a specimen of the same class as was needed to perpetuate it[2]—under the direct sanction of the General and with his orders, but without the slightest authority, legal or revolutionary, of either the local or the general Committees or of either of the Congresses, forced his way into every house he reached, ransacked them, and carried away, without even a memorandum of the names of those from whom they were taken, everything which bore the semblance of Arms,[3] leaving his victims, as far as he could possibly do so, entirely without the means of defense, easy prey for whomsoever might next appear, on an errand of similar pillage and outrage.

An amusing instance of the consequential airs assumed by the petty local Town-committees, in Westchester-county, in whom had been vested such extraordinary powers over the persons and properties of those who lived within the several Towns in which those Committees were respectively located, was seen in the action of "the Committee of Observation for "the united Town of Bedford and Precinct of Poundridge and Salem, in Westchester," on the tenth of January, 1776, in which that pompous body, "conceiving that bad consequences do arise to this distressed country from supplying the markets, at New "York, on supposition that the common enemy may, "by that means, be furnished with Provisions," for the purpose of regulating that grave irregularity, as its narrow and bigoted understanding presented the subject to its official censorship, bravely, "RESOLVED, "That from and after the date hereof, the said Committee do hereby strictly forbid any of the inhabitants of the said Town and Precincts, directly or, "indirectly, to carry or cause to be carried, by land "or water, provision of any kind to the said markets; "and do hereby direct the Minute-men and all others "that are friends to their country, to do their utmost "to stop all drovers of fat Cattle, Sheep, Hogs, Poultry, or any other Provisions whatsoever, and from "being drove or carried through either said Town or "Precincts, for the purpose aforesaid, without leave "of the said Committee," on the penalty of being deemed enemies to their country.[4]

In obedience to that local law, it appears that Jonathan Booth, a drover, while on his way to New York with a drove of Cattle, was detained at Bedford, by the Committee of that Town; but, personally, he evidently pushed forward to the City of New York; and, on the twenty-fifth of January, 1776, he laid the subject before the Committee of Safety, which was then in session, and solicited its more powerful interposition. Very promptly, that body took the subject into consideration; and, without much, if any, discussion, the Committee "came to a "Resolution," which was delivered to the anxious drover, for his comfort and relief—the Committee of Safety was not inclined to concur in the questionable theory of "patriotic" economy which was maintained by its subordinate Committee in Bedford; and, after having recited, in a Preamble, the facts and the Resolution which have been already presented, together with the additional declaration that "this "Committee, not doubting the good intentions of the "said Committee met at Poundridge, do nevertheless "conceive that the said *Resolve* has a manifest tendency to distress, in the article of Provisions, the "inhabitants of this City and other friends to Liberty "whose business may call them thither," it therefore "RESOLVED, That it is the opinion of this Committee, that no Committee of any City, Borough, Town, "or Precinct in this Colony ought to prevent any "such supplies of Provisions to this City as aforesaid, "unless they shall have due proof that such supplies "are intended to be furnished to persons engaged in

[1] Vide pages 129, 132, ante.

[2] The associations and conduct of Colonel Waterbury, while he was in the City of New York, to say nothing of his acknowledged thefts in Westchester county, afford ample evidence of his ruffianly personal character.

[3] Vide page 146, ante.

See, also, *Journal of the Provincial Congress*, "Die Sabbati, 10 ho., "A.M., Feb. 17, 1776;" and *the same*, "Die Veneris, 10 ho., A.M., "Febry. 23, 1776."

[4] Holt's *New-York Journal*, No. 1725, NEW YORK, Thursday, January 25, 1776; *Journal of the Committee of Safety*, "Die Jovis, 10 ho., A.M. "Jany. 25, 1776."

"service against the Liberties of America; nor in "such case any longer than until such Committees "respectively shall, in cases where such proof shall "have been made, have duly certified this Committee "or the Provincial Congress thereof, and until order "shall have been made thereon, by this Committee "or the Provincial Congress."[1]

The Committee of Bedford was undoubtedly served with a copy of this enactment by the Committee of Safety; and Jonathan Booth and his drove of fat Cattle were surely permitted to pass through that Town and to New York, without further molestation; but that very zealous Committee did not appear to have become entirely reconciled to the abridgement of its pretensions, made more reasonable by recent action of the Committee of Safety, when, a short time afterwards, it stopped another drove of Cattle, belonging to Joseph Booth, of Newtown, in Connecticut, while, like that which had been previously stopped, by the same Committee, it was on its way to the New York market.

In the latter instance, the obstructed drover returned to Newtown; procured a Certificate from the Committee of that Town, declaring that he "had "lately served his country as a faithful friend and "soldier in the northern Army, under General Schuy-"ler; that he had suffered by the stoppage of his "Cattle, at Bedford, on the way to the New-York "market; that he is the owner of the said Cattle; "and that the said Committee take pleasure in recom-"mending him as a friend of his country;" and, with that Certificate, he proceeded to the City of New York, and presented the case to the Provincial Congress, which was then in session. It is said "the "Congress took the same into consideration, and "came to the following determination, to wit:

"Whereas a large supply of fresh Provisions will "be required for the Continental Army, in and near "the City of New-York:

"RESOLVED AND ORDERED, That no obstruction "whatsoever be given to any person or persons in "passing and re-passing through any of the Counties "in this Colony, with fat Cattle, Sheep, Hogs, or any "kind of Provisions, for the purpose of supplying the "inhabitants of the said City of New-York or the "Continental Army, in and near the said City, unless "such person or persons shall have been adjudged to "be, or held up, as inimical to this country."

In addition to that general action of the Provincial Congress, which controlled or assumed to control every other revolutionary body within the Colony, the Congress also gave to the complaining drover, a copy of the following ORDER: "That the bearer "hereof, Joseph Booth, be permitted to pass, with "his drove of Cattle, to the City of New-York;"[2] and he evidently returned to Bedford, a happier man than when he had left that Town, a few days previously.

In the same connection, it may be proper for us to remind the reader that, about a fortnight before the Committee of Bedford made its second attempt to lay a local embargo on what was intended for the New York market, the Committee of Safety itself had interfered with the disposition of the surplus of the products of the farms in Westchester-county to residents of the neighboring Colony of Connecticut, in which, very probably, Bedford, one of the border-towns of the County, had materially suffered. The facts are thus related in the official records of the Committee of Safety;[3] and the reader may judge therefrom, something concerning the animus of the Committee of Bedford, when, on the second occasion, it interfered with the disposition of the products of Connecticut, within the Colony of New York, while the disposition of the products of farms in Bedford and its vicinity, in Connecticut, was interfered with and stopped, summarily, by a higher authority.

"Col. Gil. Drake informed the Committee that "sundry persons from Connecticut are purchasing "up" [*for speculative purposes?*] "the barrelled Beef "and Pork in Westchester. Thereupon the Commit-"tee came to the following *Resolution*, to wit:

"'WHEREAS the Continental Congress, by their "'*Resolution*' of the first day of November last, have "'resolved that no produce of the United Colonies "'be exported, except from Colony to Colony under "'the directions of the Committees of Inspection and "'Observation, and except from one part to the other "'of the same Colony, before the first day of March "'next, without the permission or order of the Con-"'tinental Congress;

"'AND WHEREAS this Committee of Safety for the "'Colony of New York conceives that it is necessary "'to prevent the sale of all the barrelled Beef and "'Pork in the County of Westchester, and to retain "'the same for the Continental service in this Col-"'ony, as such Provisions may be necessary for the "'Continental Army in this Colony:

"'RESOLVED, That the Committee of the County "'of Westchester be requested to take effectual "'means to prevent the sale and transportation of "'any barrelled Beef or Pork out of Westchester-"'county, to any person or persons residing out of "'this Colony, until the further order of the Provin-"'cial Congress or of the Committee of Safety of this "'Colony.'

"A draft of a letter to the Committee of West-"chester-county was read and approved of, and is in "the words following, to wit:

"'GENTLEMEN:

"'We have been informed by a Gentleman "'from your County, that some of the inhabitants of

[1] *Journal of Committee of Safety*, "Die Jovis, 10 ho., A.M., Janv. 25, "1776."

[2] *Journal of the Provincial Congress*, "Die Jovis, 4 ho., P.M., Feb. 29, "1776."

[3] *Journal of the Committee of Safety*, "Die Sabbati, 4 ho., P.M., Febru-"ary 10, 1776."

"'your County are disposing of their barrelled Beef "'and Pork, to persons out of the Colony. We ap- "'prehend that such Provisions will be wanted for "'the use of the Continental Army in this Colony, "'and that the service may possibly suffer if all the "'barrelled Provisions are taken out of the Colony. "'We therefore request you to take the most effectual "'measures to carry the enclosed Resolution into exe- "'cution.

"'We are, respectfully, Gentlemen,

"'Your very humble servts.,

"'By order of the Committee of Safety.

"'To the *Committee of the County of Westchester.*'"

It will be seen that the farmers of Westchester-county, at the time of which we write, were prohibited from finding a market for the surplus of their products, beyond the limits of the Colony or, at their own doors, to those who were not of New York, and that, in consequence of that prohibition, they were limited to those local purchasers, forestallers, or speculators, who should incline to purchase, and at prices which were not regulated by competition. At the same time, as has been seen, the surplus products of the farms in Connecticut were brought into the Colony, in open disregard of the provisions of that *Resolution of the Continental Congress* which was used as the warrant for the prohibition of the reciprocal trade of Westchester-county with Connecticut; and the market of New York, for nothing else than the products of the Colony of New York, which the *Resolution* would have guaranteed, if it had been impartially enforced, was recklessly destroyed, in favor of the greed of New England. Need there be any wonder that the Committee of Bedford objected, and embargoed those who had come into the Colony, from Connecticut, in violation of the *Resolution of the Continental Congress* and in derogation of the interests, if not of the Rights, of the farmers of that Town? Need there be any surprise, when doubts are raised against the integrity of those who had thus hampered the farmers of Westchester-county, when the latter had sought a market for their surplus products, compelling them to either accept a purely local market and a depreciated price or to hold, indefinitely, what they had for sale? Can any one say, honestly, that those who made those enactments, purely in the interest of the farmers of Connecticut, at the expense of those of Westchester-county, notwithstanding they were unquestionably "patriotic," were anything else than corrupt legislators and roguish, dishonest men? Will not those who know the character of Gilbert Drake, before and during and after the War, entirely understand that his motive, in moving and securing the embargo on the products of Westchester-county, without imposing a similar embargo on the products of Connecticut, was corrupt and roguish?

In the same connection, and with the same results, a few weeks subsequently, the Committee of the County of Westchester, of which the same Gilbert Drake was the Chairman and the master-spirit, undertook to prevent Abraham Liviagston, the Contractor for supplying the Continental Army with Provisions, from taking any Pork from that County, the Committee of the County of Duchess, of which Egbert Benson was the Chairman, having published a similar manifesto, to control the market after a fashion of its own creation, in that County.

The Contractor encountered so much of trouble from these interfering causes, that he was constrained to seek the interposition of the Committee of Safety; and, on the twentieth of March, that Committee, responsive to the Contractor's complaint, ordered "that "the respective Committees of the Counties of West- "chester and Duchess permit Mr Abraham Living- "ston to export Provisions of any kind whatsoever, "from either of those Counties to New-York, on his "giving, or any other such proper person as is em- "ployed on his behalf giving, such security as the "Committees approve of, to land and store such Pro- "visions in New-York or Kings-county."[1]

The facts that the Contractor for supplying the Continental Army with Provisions was subjected to the hindrances invented by these local Committees, and that the farmers within those Counties were thereby prevented from selling their surplus supply of Provisions, even for the known use of the Continental Army, like those similar prohibitions of trade, by similarly arbitrary authority, already noticed, at once so remarkable and so unaccountable, would have become stumbling-blocks in the way of the careful student of the history of the men of that period and of their doings, had not time and the opening of previously concealed records revealed the explanation of this, among others of the mysteries of the politics of the American Revolution. That explanation of the restrictions of trade, in this instance, will be noticed hereafter.

Early in January, 1776, while the conservatism of the inhabitants of Queens-county was occupying the attention of the leaders of the Rebellion; while the inhabitants of that County, because of their decided and outspoken opposition to the Rebellion and to the various Committees and Congresses which the Rebellion had called into existence, were subjected, by the Provincial Congress, to a sentence of outlawry;[2] and while, in consequence of that savage enactment and the unaccountable negligence of its duty to do something for their protection, by the naval force which then occupied the harbor of New York and commanded all the neighboring waters, that populous and thickly-settled County was overrun and pillaged and the inhabitants subjected to all classes of barbarities, by inroads from Connecticut

[1] *Journal of the Committee of Safety*, "Die Mercurii, A.M., March 20, "1776."

[2] *Journal of the Provincial Congress*, "Die Jovis, 3 ho., P.M., Decemr. "21, 1775;" Jones's *History of New York during the Revolutionary War*, i., 107–110.

and New Jersey, the latter accompanied by amateur banditti from New York City, the leaders of the Rebellion in Westchester-county, also, were anxious to join in the crusade of "patriotism," against their neighbors on the other side of the Sound—they had had practise in such a service as that, in the work of harrying their conservative neighbors, in Westchester-county; they knew that it was a profitable occupation; and they were anxious to participate in a similar service, elsewhere, where even greater profits were promised. To secure that much-desidered employment, on the eighth of January, 1776, the Committee of the County addressed the following note to the Committee of Safety, in the City of New York:

"WHITE PLAINS, 8th Janry, 1776.

"SIR:

The Committee of West Chester County having seen in the public prints that many of the "Inhabitants of Queens County are thrown out of the "Protection of the Provincial Congress; and having "been informed that they are Arming in their Defence, are greatly alarmed at their Conduct, and beg "leave to assure your honorable House, that the "Friends of Liberty in this County are willing strenuously to exert themselves to reduce the Enemies to "their Country before they are supported by the "Regular Troops If it shall be thought most advisable by the Committee of Safety, or the Provincial "or Continental Congress. We are Sir Your most "Humble Servants

"By Order of ye Committee
"WM. MILLER, *D. Chairman.*

"To Mr. *Pierre Van Cortlandt*, President of the "Committee of Safety." [1]

As the original letter remained among the papers of the Military Committee of the Provincial Congress and has been preserved, to this day, among the multitude of other inedited and unexplained manuscripts, in the office of the Secretary of State, at Albany, it is very evident that it was duly referred to that Committee; that the unholy desires of the "patriots" of Westchester-county, to join in the spoliation of fellow-colonists, in a neighboring County, without lawful reason, without any process in law, and in time of Peace, were not reciprocated by the members of that Committee; and that the application was filed, without having received any other attention whatever. In short, very appropriately, the Committee of Westchester-county was told, by that inattention, either to attend to its own business, at home, or to play the parts of freebooters, if it should continue to hanker after the spoils to be acquired in such an occupation, on its own responsibility.

In February, 1776, a movement was made by the Committee of Westchester-county, to consolidate the several Troops of Horse which were then within that County, evidently several in number and mere phantoms in weakness, the aggregate of their strength having been less than forty men; and, on the thirteenth of that month, these assembled at Wilsey Dusinberry's, in "Harrison's Precinct," and arranged themselves into a single Troop, electing their Officers, and duly reporting their doings to the Provincial Congress. The following is the official report of the Election of its Officers, made by two members of the County Committee and transmitted to the Provincial Congress:

"On the 13th of February, 1776, The Troops of "Horse in the County of Westchester was Called together at the House of Willsey Dusinberry in Harsons Precinct and There being Present between "Thirty and fourty went into an arrangement for the "Choice of officers under the Inspection of Colo "Thomas, Samuel Haviland, and William Miller "Three of the Committee where Samuel Tredwell "was Unanimously chose Capt. and Thaddeus Avory "was chose Leut unanimously Likewise Abraham "Hatfield was Chose Corneth by a majority and Uytendall Allair was Chose Quartermaster by a majority also. Certifyed by us

"THOMAS THOMAS.
"WM. MILLER." [2]

The Return was laid before the Provincial Congress on the twenty-first of February, when the Commissions were issued to the officers-elect; [3] and thus, probably, a beginning was made of that notable Troop of Horse, in Westchester-county, of which so much has been said, in romance, if not in history.

Early in February, 1776, General Lee, then chief in command, in the City of New York, informed the Committee of Safety, then in session, that he was "of opinion that the two Connecticut Regiments "and Lord Stirling's would not be sufficient for the "services he will have to perform; and he desired to "know whether it would be agreeable to the Committee that he should send to Pennsylvania for a "Regiment from thence." After due consideration, the introduction of troops from other Colonies having been found unsatisfactory, because of outrages inflicted by them on the inhabitants, the Committee of Safety adopted the following Resolution:

"RESOLVED, That if General Lee shall think it "necessary to call in the aid of any other troops than "the two Connecticut Regiments and Lord Stirling's "Regiment, that he be authorized and, in such case, "he is hereby authorized, to call in as many of the "Minute-men of this Colony as he shall, at any time, "think necessary." [4]

In accordance with the authority which was thus delegated to General Lee, on the following day,

[1] *Historical Manuscripts*, etc.: *Military Committee*, xxv., 624.

[2] *Historical Manuscripts*, etc.: *Military Returns*, xxvii., 254.

[3] *Journal of the Provincial Congress*, "Die Mercurii, P.M., Feb. 21, "1776."

[4] *Journal of the Committee of Safety*, "Die Veneris, 10 ho., A.M., Feb. "9, 1776."

[*February* 9, 1776] a letter was addressed to Colonel Samuel Drake, ordering the skeleton Regiment of Westchester-county Minute-men into active service. That letter may properly find a place in this narrative: it was in the following words:

"NEW YORK, Feb'y 9th 1776.

"SIR:

"You will see by the enclosed Resolution "that Major General Lee now at New York is author-"ized to call in as many of the Minute Men of this "Colony as he may think necessary.

"I am directed by the General to have some Regi-"ments of Minute Men called here directly.

"Your Regiment is fixed on by the Committee of "Safety of this Colony as proper to be called.

"You are therefore on receipt hereof to march with "your Regiment to New York with all possible dis-"patch. Take care that your men have their knap-"sacks and Blankets with them & provisiens for their "march.—The Quartermaster ought by all means to "come with the Regiment.

"It is not doubted but you will give orders that "your Troops observe the greatest regularity in their "march, and if you order the several Companies to "proceed" [*precede?*] "each other a few miles in their "march they will be more easily accommodated.

"Suffer no Delay in bringing in your Regiment.

"I am respectfully Sir your very humble serv^t

"R. YATES, *Ch.*

"P.S.—It is expected that Col^o Drake will leave a "sufficient Guard of his Regiment at the cannon be-"yond Kings-bridge.—He will be a proper judge how "many may be necessary for that small service."[1]

As Captain Varian and his eighteen companions, facetiously regarded as one of the Companies of Minute-men of which Colonel Drake's Regiment was subsequently composed, were, then, unknown as soldiers,[2] that Regiment could not have possibly mustered more than two Companies commanded, respectively, by Captains Slason and Seely[3]—that commanded by Captain Gray was not organized until six days after the Regiment had been ordered into the service;[4] and no record appears of any attempt having been made to organize the two Companies, in the Cortlandt's Manor, for which blank Commissions had been issued, in advance of any organization, in the preceding October[5]—although it is understood that those Companies which were commanded by Captains Gray and Steinrod subsequently joined it. There is no known *Return* of the actual strength of the Regiment, at any time; but within a few days after it had entered the Continental service, and after its reinforcement had joined it, it numbered not more than a hundred and fifty men;[6] and about two weeks subsequently, little more than a month after it had been mustered in, it was made ridiculous and the propensity to office-holding among "the friends of Liberty," in Westchester-county, was forcibly illustrated by the following paragraph, which appeared in the *General Orders* of the commanding Officer of the Continental Army in New York:

"HEAD-QUARTERS, March 16, 1776.

"As Colonel Drake's Regiment of Minute-men "consists of one hundred and eleven private men, "present, and yet have no less than four Field "Officers, two Captains, and thirteen other Commis-"sioned Officers, and twenty Non-commissioned "Officers, it is unreasonable to put the Continent to "the enormous expense of maintaining so many "Officers for the use of so few men; and it is there-"fore ordered that one Field-officer, two Captains, "four Lieutenants, two Ensigns, the Adjutant, and "Quartermaster, eight Sergeants, eight Corporals, or "Drums or Fifes, and no other Officer do remain with "that small part of the Regiment: the other Officers "are to return to their County, in order to complete "their Corps. Colonel Swartwout[7] and Lieutenant-"colonel Humphreys[8] are to observe the same rule in "proportion to their numbers; and they are all of "them to send into Headquarters, *Returns* of their "respective Corps, present."[9]

The reader will become better acquainted with this portion of the history of Colonel Samuel Drake's Regiment of Westchester-county Minute-men, by-and-by.

The Regiment, when it reached the City of New-York, was employed in the construction of a redoubt, on Hoern's Hook, at the mouth of the Harlem-river, for the defence of the pass of Hell-Gate as well as to command the ferry to Long Island, which, even at that early period, had been established at that place;[10]

[1] *Historical Manuscripts*, etc.: *Military Committee*, xxv., 658.

[2] Vide pages 108, ante.

[3] Ibid.

[4] *Returns of an Election of Officers of that Company*, "BEDFORD, 15 Feby, "1776."—*Historical Manuscripts*, etc.: *Military Returns*, xxvii., 196.

[5] *Memorandum by Gilbert Drake, Chairman of Westchester-county Committee*, "WHITE PLAINS, October 24, 1775;" *Journal of Provincial Congress*, "Die Mercurii, 10 ho., A.M., October 25, 1775."

[6] Captain Gray's Company probably marched from Bedford, on the sixteenth of February, agreeably to the premise that it should do so; and on the twenty-ninth of the same month, General Lee said of the Regiment and of a Company detached from another Regiment, together forming the garrison at Hoern's Hook, "Drake's Regiment of Minute-"Men and one more Company, (*in all about two hundred*,) are stationed at "Horn's Hook, which commands Hell-Gate. They are employed in "throwing up a redoubt, to contain three hundred men," (*General Lee to General Washington*, "NEW-YORK, February 29, 1776.")

[7] Jacobus Swartwout was Colonel of one of the Regiments, so called, of Duchess-county Minute-men, (*Historical Manuscripts*, etc.: *Military Returns*, xxvi., 3.)

[8] Lieutenant-colonel Cornelius Humphreys evidently commanded the Regiment of Duchess-county Minute-men, of which John Van Ness was Colonel and Robert G. Livingston, Junior, one of the Majors. (*Historical Manuscripts*, etc.: *Military Returns*, xxvi., 3.)

[9] *General Orders of Lord Stirling, General of the Continental Troops*, "HEAD-QUARTERS, March 16, 1776."

[10] *General Lee to General Washington*, "NEW-YORK, February 29, 1776;" Jones's *History of New York during the Revolutionary War*, i., 69.

At the period referred to in the text, that was known as "Waldron's "Ferry."

but it was composed of men of notorious poverty and meanness,[1] by no means representative men of the yeomanry of Westchester-county; "many of them" were, "destitute of "arms"[2] and, therefore, useless for soldiers; and it appears that, as such characters were apt to be, they were recklessly destructive of the private property of those who were richer than they, not sparing, even, the property of those who had endeavored to make them more than ordinarily comfortable.[3] The Lieutenant-colonel of the Regiment, who was, also, a Deputy from Westchester-county in the Provincial Congress, complained to that body that the Regiment "lodged in an uncom-"fortable manner for the want of Cribs for its beds;" and he insisted that it was "necessary that a car-"penter be sent to make Cribs for their beds;" and a carpenter was accordingly sent to Hoern's Hook, for the purpose of making "Cribs" for the greater comfort of Westchester-county's "patriotic" Minute-men.[4]

It does not appear how long that particular Regiment remained in the service of the Continent; but it was evidently mustered in for only a short term of service; and that, at the expiration of that brief term, it was discharged and mustered out, disappearing, for ever, from the field of military service.

On the nineteenth of January, 1776, the Continental Congress ordered four Battalions to be raised for the defence of the Colony of New York;[5] and, on the twenty-sixth of the same month, the experiment of starting the work of enlistment, for those four Battalions, by jobbing out the Offices which would be required, among the several Counties, with invitations for estimates of the numbers of men who could "be "speedily raised and armed," in the respective Counties, by that proffered bait of Offices, was the first action which was taken by the revolutionary authorities, in New York, on that important subject.[6]

On the following day, [*January* 27, 1776,] the Committee of Safety issued its *Instructions for the Recruiting Officers* who should be employed in the enlistment of men for the service referred to, in that new Order—the pay of the Privates was to be five dollars per month; each was to receive, as a bounty, a felt hat, a pair of yarn stockings, a pair of shoes, and, if they could be procured, a hunting-shirt and a blanket; and the men were to provide their own Arms. There was no specified term of service; but the Privates—not the Officers—were "liable to be discharged at any "time, on allowing them one month's pay extraordi-"nary."[7]

There appears to have been great backwardness in enlisting, however—those who were expected to step into the ranks and to do the fatigue duty and the fighting, while the more favored ones of the Rebellion had occupied all the offices, in advance, and were predestinated to enjoy all that was comfortable and to issue all the orders and to be implicitly obeyed, were slow in their responses; only those who were extremely poor, and whose actual necessities obliged them, or those whose morals were questionable, and who enlisted either to retire from adverse observation or to secure a wider field for their unholy practices, appearing to have been willing to support "the Liber-"ties of America," in the field, even where there was no enemy and where none was really expected.[8] Indeed, so discouraging were the reports from those who had been entrusted with the Warrants for recruiting, that, on the fifteenth of February, the Provincial Congress, on the recommendation of a Committee who had been appointed to consider the subject, determined to apportion a specified quota of Officers and Privates to each of the Counties in the Colony, in order that the organization of the required Battalions might be effected in the shortest possible period.[9] Three days subsequently, [*February* 18, 1776,] another Committee who had been appointed to apportion the different quota of Officers and Privates to be raised in the several Counties, made a Report, which was adopted, two Companies, as we have already stated, being apportioned to Westchester-county;[10] and, on the afternoon of the same day, a Circular Letter was sent by the Provincial Congress to each of the County-committees throughout the Colony, informing it of the arrangement and urging its attention to the matter of the enlistments. As that Circular Letter is peculiarly interesting, in its details of the terms of enlistment into the Continental Army of 1776, a place may properly be found for it, in these pages. It was in the following words:

"IN PROVINCIAL CONGRESS,
"NEW-YORK, Feb. 18, 1776.

"SIR:

"The Congress having determined that your Coun-"ty shall have the opportunity of raising [*two*] Com-"panies in the four Regiments to be raised by order

[1] *Colonel Samuel Drake to the Provincial Congress*, "NEW-YORK, Feby. "16, 1776," compared with the letter of Dirck Lefferts, *post*.

[2] *Colonel Samuel Drake to the Provincial Congress*, "NEW-YORK, Feby. "16, 1776."

[3] *Dirck Lefferts to the Deputies of the several Counties*, etc., "May 1, "1776."

[4] *Journal of the Provincial Congress*, "Die Martis, 3 ho., P.M., March "12, 1776."

[5] *Journal of the Continental Congress*, "Friday, January 19, 1776."

[6] *Journal of the Committee of Safety*, "Die Veneris, 3 ho., P.M., Janv. "26, 1776," and the Circular Letter, containing the proposed system, which was ordered to be sent to each of the several County Committees, on the same day.

[7] *Instructions to the Colonels and other Officers for Enlistment*, etc., "COMMITTEE OF SAFETY, NEW-YORK, Janv. 27, 1776."

[8] *Elihu Marvin, Chairman, to the Committee of Safety*, "IN COUNTY "COMMITTEE, OXFORD, Feb. 15, 1776;" *Zephaniah Platt, Chairman, to the Provincial Congress*, "POUGHKEEPSIE, Feb. 9, 1776;" *Captain William Barker to the Provincial Congress*, "AMENIA, March 4, 1776"; *William Smith, Chairman*, "SUFFOLK COUNTY, Janv. 24, 1776;" *The Committee of Albany County to the Committee of Safety*, "ALBANY, April 2, 1775"; etc.

[9] *Journal of the Provincial Congress*, "Die Jovis, P.M., Feb. 15, 1776."

[10] *Journal of the Provincial Congress*, "Die Solis, 10 ho., A.M., Feb. 18, "1776."

"of the Continental Congress, for the defence of this "Colony, have resolved that blank Warrants for the "Officers of the same shall be sent to your Com-"mittee.

"You will observe by the enclosed Resolves that "you are restrained in the appointments to give the "preference to such persons as have served their Com-"try in the last Campaign; but it is not, by any "means, the design of Congress that men who have "misbehaved themselves should be any further em-"ployed.

"It is expected that the people will readily enlist "in these Regiments, as they are raised for the ex-"press purpose of defending this Colony; and unless "we raise them from among ourselves, in all proba-"bility they will be sent from other Colonies, which "will be to our everlasting disgrace.

"We have great confidence in your zeal for the "common cause, and trust you will exert yourselves "that these levies be completed with all possible de-"spatch.

"We are, Sir, your very hble. servants,
"By order,
"NATHANIEL WOODHULL, Pres't."

"It is expected that each man furnishes himself "with a good gun and bayonet, tomahawk, knapsack "or haversack, and two bills. But those who are not "able to furnish themselves with these arms and ac-"coutrements will be supplied at the public expense, "for the payment of which small stoppages will be "made out of their monthly pay, till the whole are "paid for; then they are to remain the property of "the men."[1]

Notwithstanding all the inducements which the Provincial Congress and its various office-seeking recruiting agents could offer, however, the staid and conservative farmers of Westchester-county were slow to enlist into the Continental service—there had been much discontentment among those who were in the service, under Colonel Holmes, in the preceding year;[2] and on the return of those malcontents, they had undoubtedly told the story of their respective grievances to their surprised and sympathetic neighbors; besides which hindrance, the conservatism of the County had been too barbarously treated by those who were in rebellion, to permit it to extend to that "common cause" the slightest favor, while the wounds which it had thus received were yet bleeding. It was, indeed, true that Warrants had been sent with the Circular Letter, in February; and it is undoubtedly true, also, that the favored ones, throughout the County, Warrants in hand and Offices in prospective, had employed all their powers of conciliation and persuasion to ensure a successful enlistment of the quota and the consequent reward to themselves; but Westchester-county would not be conciliated far enough to send her well-to-do sons into the Army; and the Warrants were returned to the Congress and the proffered Offices were not secured by those who had hankered for them. The prospect for the four Battalions, as far as Westchester-county was concerned in it, was not promising; and the Committee of Safety was already entertaining the proposal to call back the Warrants which had been sent into the County, more than two months previously, when a letter was received by that body, from Gilbert Drake, the Chairman of the Committee of the County, stating that one, Ezekiel Hyatt, or Haight, with his associates, had enlisted seventy men in Westchester-county, for a Connecticut Regiment; but was inclined to take them, as a portion of the quota of that County, into a New York Regiment, if Commissions could be assured to those who were designated as their Officers.[3]

Subsequently, it was seen that the men whom Ezekial Hyatt, or Haight, or Hait—for by each of these several names that "patriotic" gentleman was known, at different times—had enlisted into his Company had been entrapped, by false representations;[4] and the revelations of unopened records of that period, more recently opened, reveal the fact that Commissions had already been issued, by the Continental Congress, to Ezekiel Hait, Esquire, as Captain,[5] to Caleb Hobby, Gentleman, as First Lieutenant,[6] to Joseph De Groet, Gentleman, as Second Lieutenant,[7] and to Isaac Poineair, Gentleman, as Ensign,[8] all dated on the eighth of April, more than a fortnight before Gilbert Drake wrote to the Committee of Safety, asking Commissions for the same Officers from the Provincial Congress of New York; and that each of those Commissions had specifically described the Company to which the holder of the Commission was attached, not as belonging to a Connecticut Regiment, but as "the Company of the First "Regiment of New York Forces." But, whatever schemes may have been laid to carry the Company into the Connecticut Line of the Continental Army, and notwithstanding the men enlisted into the Company had been fraudulently entrapped into a service which they did not intend to enter,[9] Captain Hyatt

[1] *Journal of the Provincial Congress*, "Die Solis, P.M., Feb. 18, "1776."

[2] Vide pages 100, 101, ante.

[3] *Gilbert Drake to "Mr. Morin Scott,"* "April the 21th, 1776;" *Journal of the Committee of Safety*, "Die Jovis, 10 ho., A.M., April 25, 1776."

[4] *A List of the Officers' names in New York Troops, etc.: Col. McDougal's Regiment*, (5).—*Historical Manuscripts*, etc.: *Military Committee*, xxv., 188.

[5] *Historical Manuscripts*, etc.: *Military Returns*, xxvii., 88.

[6] *Historical Manuscripts*, etc.: *Military Returns*, xxvii., 96.

[7] *Historical Manuscripts*, etc.: *Military Returns*, xxvii., 92.

[8] *Historical Manuscripts*, etc.: *Military Returns*, xxvii., 104.

[9] There are good reasons for believing that that Company, like the similar Company commanded by Cornelius Steenrod, of which mention will be made, hereafter, had been really enlisted for Colonel Samuel Drake's Regiment of Minute-men, then at Hoero's Hook, as already stated; and that a system of schemes had followed, first with Alexander McDougal, of the first New-York Regiment; then with some Connectic

and his command were accepted by the Committee of Safety, as one of the two Companies required from Westchester-county;[1] and it subsequently constituted the Fifth Company of the First Regiment of the New York Line, commanded by Colonel Alexander McDougal.[2] It was said of the Company, afterwards, that the Captain "has deceived the Convention" [*the Provincial Congress*,] "in Enlisting the men "for 6 & 12 months instead of doing it for the "war;"[3] that the men, who had, also, been deceived by their Captain, deserted in large numbers;[4] that the Regiment was greatly reduced by the desertions, of which those from this Company were part;[5] and the Company was thereby disgraced, through all time. Of Captain Hyatt, it was stated that he was "unfit" to be retained in the service,[6] as "he wants authority "to make a good Officer:"[7] of the three Subalterns, the same record stated, "These three wish to de-"cline the service; they will be no loss to it."[8]

Two days after Ezekiel Hyatt, through the Chairman of the Committee of Westchester-county, had secured a place for himself and his command, in the New York Line of the Continental Army, [*April* 27, 1776,] Cornelius Steenrod appeared, personally, before the Committee of Safety, in the City of New York, and informed that Committee "that he can enlist a "complete Company of men for the Continental ser-"vice, in fourteen days;" and the Committee, after due consideration of the proposal, adopted a Resolution giving to him "full assurance that he and his "Subalterns, with the said Company, will be em-"ployed as part of the troops raising for the defence "of this Colony," provided a full and complete Company of able bodied men should be enlisted and made ready to join a Regiment, within the designated period of fourteen days.[9]

That Cornelius Steenrod was a Miller, on the Cortlandt's Manor; evidently a man of some property;[10] and an intimate friend and *confidante* of Stephen De Lancey, a son of the late distinguished Chief-justice De Lancey, who was also one of the Proprietors and a resident of that Manor,[11] there can be no doubt. He was peculiarly anxious to obtain an office, no matter what, nor on what terms;[12] he was particularly zealous in his desire that he might administer test-oaths to his neighbors;[13] and it is more than probable that he was, in fact, a "friend of the Government," in disguise, notwithstanding all his official disclaimers.[14] He had been in command of one of the skeleton Companies of Minute-men of which the skeleton Regiment of Colonel Samuel Drake had been nominally composed[15]—it is more than probable that one of those two blank Commissions, for Captains of Companies, which had been issued in advance of the formation of those Companies,[16] was held by him; and it is far from impossible that the men whom he and his Subalterns had evidently on hand, when he applied to the Committee of Safety for admittance into the service of the Continent, in a different Regiment, had been really enlisted for the re-inforcement of the former Regiment, then at Hoern's Hook.

He evidently completed his Company, in season to take a place, as the second Company of the apportionment to Westchester-county, in the First Regiment of the New York Line, in the Continental Army of 1776, commanded by Colonel Alexander McDougal, of which it was the Sixth Company, Isaac Titus having been his First Lieutenant, Isaac Ruyckman, Junior, his Second Lieutenant, and Benjamin Jones his Ensign.[17] But, like Captain Hyatt, Captain Steenrod had deceived his men and the Congress, in his enlistment of his command for six and twelve months instead of for the entire period of

parties; and finally with the Committee of Westchester-county—each scheme having been an improvement on those which had preceded it—for the disposition of the Company, just as schemes were formed for the promotion of personal interests of Officers, and just as Enlisted Men were trucked and battered into Regiments which were foreign to them, for the promotion of those schemes, in another service, within the memory of living men.

[1] *Journal of the Committee of Safety*, "Die Jovis, 4 ho., P.M., April 25, "1776."

[2] *List of Officers' names of New York Troops, viz.: Colonel McDougal's Regiment,—Historical Manuscripts*, etc.: *Military Committee*, xxv., 488.

[3] Ibid.

[4] *General Alexander McDougal to Robert Yates*, "YONKERS, 21 October, "1776."

[5] Ibid.

[6] *General McDougal's Recommendation of Lieutenant-Colonel Van Cortlandt —Historical Manuscripts*, etc.: *Military Committee*, xxv., 815.

[7] *List of Officers' names of New York Troops, viz.: Colonel McDougal's Regiment.—Historical Manuscripts*, etc.: *Military Committee*, xxv., 488.

[8] Ibid.

[9] *Journal of the Committee of Safety*, "Die Sabbati, 10 ho., A.M., April "27, 1776."

[10] Cornelius Steenrod was the owner of three fulling-mills, if not of some others; and he addressed "the Convention," without date, requesting protection for his millers.—*Cornelius Steenrod to "the Convention,"* without place or date—*Journals of the Provincial Congress*, ii., 147.

[11] *Cornelius Steenrod to the Committee of Safety*, "January 31, 1777;" *the Commissioners of Sequestration to the Council of Safety*, "PEEKS KILL, July "24, 1777;" *Stephen De Lancey to Cornelius Steenrod*, "May 3, 1777;" *Testimony of Cornelius Steenrod before the Committee of Westchester-county*, June 13, 1777; *Cornelius Steenrod to the Convention of the State*, "WEST-"CHESTER COUNTY, CORTLANDT MANOR, June 28, 1777," and the several enclosures therein; etc.

[12] He was anxious, by turns, to command a Troop of Horse, to command a Company of Minute-men, and to raise and command a Company in the Continental Line; and, in neither of these, does he appear to have paid much respect to the proprieties of the undertaking.

[13] *Cornelius Steenrod to "the Convention,"* without place or date—*Journals of the Provincial Congress*, ii., 147.

[14] In June, 1776, Isaac Youngs testified before the Committee on Conspiracies, of the Provincial Congress, that Thomas Vernon, that prisoner who had so much trouble, had informed him that one of the Captains in McDougal's Regiment of Continentals, was a loyalist, in correspondence with Governor Tryon, and acting under the orders of the Governor. (*Historical Manuscripts*, etc.: *Miscellaneous Papers*, xxxiv., 401.)

Cornelius Steenrod had only recently joined that Regiment, at the head of a Company, when that statement was made.

[15] *General Lord Stirling's General Orders*, "NEW YORK, March 16, "1776."

[16] *Journal of the Provincial Congress*, "Die Mercurii, 10 ho., A.M., Oc-"tober 25, 1776."

[17] *List of Officers' names of New York Troops, viz.: Colonel McDougal's Regiment—Historical Manuscripts*, etc.: *Military Committee*, xxv., 488.

the War;[1] his command reciprocating, like that of Captain Hyatt, by deserting, in great numbers, and, thereby, seriously crippling the Regiment;[2] and, also like Captain Hyatt, personally, he was reported as "unfit" for his command.[3] The similarity of that Company and its Officers and that commanded by Captain Hyatt and its Officers is singularly continued in the fact that the Second Lieutenant who was with Captain Steenrod when the Company was mustered into the Continental Service, was subsequently cashiered,[4] assuredly for conduct which was more than ordinarily bad; and in the Report, concerning First Lieutenant Titus and Ensign Jones, that "These two are unfit for the service."[5]

Captain Ambrose Horton, who commanded one of the Companies from Westchester-county, in the Campaign of 1775, appears to have returned to the service, probably from another County, in 1776;[6] but nothing more than a mere mention of his name was made, without the slightest additional information. Neither Captain Daniel Mills nor Captain Jonathan Platt, each of whom had commanded a Company from Westchester-county, in the Campaign of 1775, appears to have returned to the service, in 1776.

It will be seen, from the respective records of the fraudulent practices of Ezekiel Hyatt and Cornelius Steenrod and their respective associates, in their enlistment of men for their respective commands; from the records of the questionable manner in which their respective Companies were carried, without their consent, into a line of the Continental Service for which they were not enlisted; from the records of the personal unfitness for their respective offices of the several Officers of both these Companies; and from those of the consequent disaffection and desertions of the enlisted men, that Westchester-county's quota, in the Continental levy of 1776, was of questionable usefulness to the country or the cause in which it was nominally engaged. Whatever may have been the character and conduct of the Non-commissioned Officers and Privates of which those Companies were respectively composed—and it is due to the memory of those unknown men that it should be said of them that no record of bad conduct, on their parts, has come down among the *debris* of that period, since it cannot be regarded as a crime that some of them, unbidden, in that era of disregard of law, helped themselves to the freedom, belonging to themselves, of which their Officers had fraudulently deprived them—it cannot be consistently pretended, by any one, that the Officers of those Companies were reasonably representative men of the great body of the farmers of Colonial Westchester-county, of that or of any other period: whether or not they may be regarded as representative men of that other and smaller class of the inhabitants of that County, in 1775–76, of those whose "patriotism" was only ill-concealed selfishness, of those whose devotion to "the common cause" was graduated with nothing else than with the promised profits of the investment, of those whose zeal was tempered with nothing as effective as with an Office of some sort, the reader can determine for himself, from the evidence which has been already adduced, illustrative of the character and conduct of the revolutionary faction, within that County, during that later Colonial Period.

Among the multitude of requirements, made by General Lee, either on his own motion or at the prompting of those who pandered to his baser inclinations, and which were obsequiously obeyed by the Provincial Congress, was one, made early in March, 1776, for "a Magazine of Provisions and Military "Stores, to be established in Westchester-county," the requisition being supplemented with a recommendation that "the Deputies of Westchester-county "purchase and deposit, in different stores in that "County, twelve hundred barrels of good salted Pork, "wherever it is to be bought; and that the said "salted Pork be repacked and pickled by a sworn "Packer of New York; and that the Deputies of "Albany-county purchase eighteen hundred and fifty "bushels of good Peas, and send them to the Deputies of Westchester-county, to be by them stored in "the same manner."[7]

The proposed test of the quality of the Pork to be purchased was, however, not satisfactory to those who were manipulating the Congress, in the interest of the job; and, on the ninth of March, when that body resumed the consideration of the proposition, it was led to suppose that the Resolution which had been adopted, approving the same, was "imperfect, "inadequate to the end, and that the method thereby "proposed will create unnecessary expense." It also appointed a Committee of three Deputies, two of whom were John Thomas, Junior, and Colonel Joseph Drake, both of them Deputies from Westchester-county, "to reconsider the method of establishing a "Magazine of Provisions, and to report thereon."[8]

[1] Ibid.

[2] *General Alexander McDougal to Robert Yates*, "YONKERS, 21 October, "1776."

[3] *General McDougal's Recommendation of Lieutenant-colonel Cortlandt*—*Historical Manuscripts*, etc.: *Military Committee*, XXV., 845.

[4] *Captain Steenrod to the Provincial Congress*, "CAMP AT NEW YORK, "20 June, 1776."

[5] *List of Officers' Names of New-York Troops, viz., Colonel McDougal's Regiment.*—*Historical Manuscripts*, etc.: *Military Committee*, XXV., 488.

[6] Recruiting Warrants were issued to him, on the tenth of March, 1776, and to Thomas Le Foy, on the twenty-eighth of the same month, for the Ninth Company of the First Regiment of the New York Line of the Continental Army of 1776; but the record says, also, "Captain Horton "and Officers' commissions not made out," (*Recruiting Warrants issued by the Convention to the First New York Continentals*—*Historical Manuscripts*, etc.: *Military Committee*, XXV., 165, 676;) and it is probable that they were among those whose blandishments were unsuccessful in obtaining recruits, as has been stated in the text, (*page* 145, *ante*.)

[7] *Journal of the Provincial Congress*, "Die Lunæ, 3 ho., P.M., March "4, 1776."

[8] *Journal of the Provincial Congress*, "Die Sabbati, 10 ho., A.M., March "9, 1776."

The whole subject had evidently been considered, informally, before it was laid before the Congress—in the expressive phrase of practical men, it had been "cut and dried"—and the Committee "speedily re-"turned and reported" a substitute for the original Resolution, which was more "perfect," more "ade-"quate to the end," and less expensive, although it was also, less favorable to the Congress—it did no more than to omit the provision for the employment of a Packer from New York, by whom, also, the quality of the Pork could have been accurately ascertained, leaving every other portion of the original Resolution, in the form in which it had been adopted, five days previously. The evidently pre-arranged Report and Resolution were promptly approved, without a dissenting voice;[1] and the scheme was, so far, a complete success.

There does not appear to have been a doubt concerning the entire safety of such a Magazine, nor of such a series of Magazines, notwithstanding the known hostility of by far the greater number of the inhabitants of Westchester-county, within which they were to be established, against all which pertained to the Rebellion—an hostility, too, which had become intensified by reason of the repeated and ruinous outrages to which the Conservatives among them, and few were not Conservatives, had been subjected; and if anything were wanted to establish the fact of the quiet, law-observing, and upright personal character of those much abused and much persecuted farmers of Colonial Westchester-county, it may be found in that voluntary tribute to their integrity, thus unwittingly, but freely, paid by their most virulent enemies. A Military Magazine established in the midst of a community who was hostile to those who gathered and established it, without ample provision for its protection, and depending, largely, if not entirely, for its safety, on the forbearance of those among whom it was placed, was an anomaly in Military Science; but the farmers of Westchester-county were not inclined to retaliate; and those who were leaders in the Rebellion could, therefrom, have learned something which would have been useful to themselves and to their "common cause," had not they been besotted in their greed for Office and its emoluments and for the authority and the opportunities for personal aggrandizement which office-bearing, in a revolutionary era, always affords to those who are the greater zealots.

The Deputies from Westchester-county were not slow in their movements, homeward, as soon as that Report and that Resolution had been adopted, leaving the Deputation in the Congress without the requisite quorum, in their eager pursuit of the advantages, to themselves, which were offered in their purchases of barrelled Pork. The reason for the embargo which had closed the foreign markets against the producers and which had monopolized the trade in favor of the local buyers and at their own prices, was then made manifest to all observers; and the favored Deputies, who were the official buyers, and their personal friends were provided with an outlet, at favorable prices, not only for the surplus of their own products, but for those additional stocks which the rigidly enforced embargo and their more accurate knowledge of what the future was to develope, had placed within their control; and that without any limitations concerning prices to be paid, and without any danger, concerning the quality of the article to be sold, from the adverse reports of a sworn Packer and Inspector, from the City of New York.

On the thirteenth of March, a letter was received from General Washington, expressing to "the Com-"manding Officer of the American Forces, New "York,"[2] the suspicions of the Commander-in-chief that the Royal Army which was then enclosed in Boston would soon be transferred to New York, and appealing to the Provincial Congress for its best efforts "to "prevent their forming a lodgment before" [*he, General Washington,*] "can come or send to your assist-"ance."

The intelligence thus communicated to the Provincial Congress, for General Lord Stirling immediately submitted the letter to that body, led to another revision of the Resolution authorizing the establishment of a Military Magazine in Westchester-county, already referred to, which resulted in the adoption of the following Resolution, not necessarily as a substitute for the other, nor probably regarded as such a substitute, in practise:

"ORDERED, That Colonel Gilbert Drake repair "immediately to Westchester-county and purchase "twelve hundred barrels of the best Pork, and "have the same safely stored, agreeable to the "Resolves of this Congress, of the ninth day of "March instant; that he take with him, from New-"York, a sworn Inspector and Repacker of Pork, to "inspect and re-pack the same; and that he purchase "and store, at the cheapest rate in his power, Flour "sufficient for the use of five thousand men for a "month."[3]

Notwithstanding the adroitness of Colonel Gilbert Drake, in concentrating within his own person the sole authority to purchase all the Pork and all the Flour which were considered necessary, when the last-named Resolution was adopted by the Provincial Congress, his associates in the Deputation from Westchester-county were already in the field, bargaining for barrelled Pork, under the provisions of the former Resolution; entering into competition

[1] *Journal of the Provincial Congress*, "Die Sabbati, 10 ho., A. M., March "9, 1776."

[2] *Stephen Moylan, A.D.C., to the Commanding Officer of the American Forces in New York*, "CAMBRIDGE, 9th March, 1776."

[3] *Journal of the Provincial Congress*, "Die Mercurii, 10 ho., A.M., March "13, 1776."

with him, among the sellers of Pork, who were not slow to take advantage of that circumstance, in advancing the prices of the goods; and, to a corresponding extent, intercepting, advantageously to themselves, the profits of those particular transactions which, but for their interference, would have fallen into his basket.

The Provincial Congress had adjourned, leaving its Committee of Safety to discharge its ordinary duties;[1] and William Paulding was the only Deputy from Westchester-county who remained in the City of New York. But, on the afternoon of the first day of the existence of that Committee, [*March* 18, 1776,] Mr. Paulding, whose hand was evidently clean while those of all his fellow Deputies were seriously smirched, "informed the Committee that several of the "members from Westchester-county, conceiving that "they were directed to purchase Pork for a Magazine, "were purchasing quantities for that purpose; that "Colonel Gilbert Drake, by a late *Order* of the "Congress, was also purchasing the whole quantity "directed to be stored in that County, whereby there "is danger that the said article of Provisions may "be purchased at an exorbitant price."[2]

After due consideration of the subject, the Committee of Safety determined to limit the price to be paid for the Pork, leaving the rival buyers undisturbed, which was undoubtedly done for political reasons—it would not have been prudent to have arrested the Deputation of a County, while it was so eagerly engaged in a still-hunt for some of the pickings which had been placed within its reach, by the revolutionary leaders. The enactment of the Committee of Safety was in these words:

"Whereas different appointments have been made "by the Provincial Congress, for the purchase of "barreled Pork, in Westchester-county; it is there-"fore

"ORDERED, That no person employed in that ser-"vice pay more for that article of Provision than four "pounds per barrel, subject to the expense of the "sellers for cartage to the place of delivery in the "County."[3]

On the first of April, 1776—ample time having elapsed, since the two *Orders* were made, to enable all which could be done in the way of purchases and sales of Pork and Flour, to have been done, satisfactorily to those who were originally in the secret—the Committee of Safety discovered what it regarded as a fact, that such a Military Magazine as General Lee had called for and which the Provincial Congress had deliberately established, would "not be absolutely necessary;" and it accordingly "ORDERED, That Colonel "Gilbert Drake and the other members of West-"chester-County do not purchase any more Pro-"visions, until farther order; and that they return "with all convenient speed to this Committee, an ac-"count of all the Provisions they have purchased, and "in what stores they are placed."[4]

It required eight days for the Committee's letter and *Order* to reach the busy Deputies and to arrest their eager searches for Pork and Flour; but on the eighth day, [*April* 9, 1776,] Colonel Drake reported that he, and John Thomas, Junior, and Major Lockwood, three of the migratory Deputies, had bought about one thousand barrels of the former and six hundred barrels of the latter;[5] from which one may learn something of the productiveness of Colonial Westchester-county, in 1775, notwithstanding the disturbances, already referred to, to which its inhabitants had been so frequently and so seriously subjected—the usual Autumn and Winter sales of these two staple articles had been undoubtedly made; extraordinary sales had been made for the Northern Army and for distant places, many of them having been made matters of official record; the home-consumption had been supplied, freely, during the Autumn, the Winter, and the early Spring; and the necessary supplies, also for the home-consumption, until the following Autumn, had been undoubtedly reserved; but the supply was not exhausted; and a thousand barrels of salted Pork and six hundred barrels of Flour had been found and purchased, on the account of the Provincial Congress, within the limited period of three weeks, and within the limits of that single County. The Westchester-county farmers of our own period, with their greater numbers and greater area of tillable ground, with their modern appliances of artificial manures and improved implements—none of them, at that time, even hoped for—and with all the improved facilities of transit and of transportation which they now possess, may reasonably hang their heads, in humiliation, on a comparison of the results of their labors with the results of the labors of those industrious, prudent, and thrifty men who preceded them, with smaller numbers and none of the advantages which are now accessible to every one.

Reference has been made to the action of the Provincial Congress encouraging the establishment of Powder-mills, and offering loans for that purpose, without interest, to proper persons, in specified Counties, of which Westchester was one. Although no mention was subsequently made of the establishment of such a Mill within the limits of Westchester-county, the fact that such an offer was made affords another testimony to what has been already adduced concerning the peaceful disposition of the farmers, throughout that County, even in the face of the greatest

[1] *Journal of the Provincial Congress*, "Die Sabbati, 9 ho., A.M., March "16, 1776."

[2] *Journal of the Committee of Safety*, "Die Lunæ, 4 ho., P.M., March "18, 1776."

[3] Ibid.

[4] *Journal of the Committee of Safety*, "Die Lunæ, 9 ho., A.M., April 1, "1776."

[5] *Journal of the Committee of Safety*, "Die Mercurii, 4 ho., P.M., April "17, 1776."

aggravations, since the want of the Arms of which they had been robbed would not have been a hindrance to any one who had desired to destroy a Powder-mill; and it shows, also, how unwise that revolutionary policy had been, which had tended not only to impair the industrial usefulness of such a community, at a time when the results of its agricultural and other industrial labors were most needed, but to make that element, in the Colony, permanently antagonistic, which, under a peaceful and conciliatory policy, might have been made passive and useful, if not friendly and co-operative.

After the autocratic General Lee was ordered to the South, in March, 1776, the military command of the Continental forces in the City of New York was vested in General Lord Stirling; and, on the thirteenth of that month, that commanding General requested the Provincial Congress to appoint a Committee, to confer with him on various subjects connected with the defense of the City and Colony.[1]

On the following day, [*March* 14, 1776,] for the purpose of putting the City into a proper condition to sustain an attack, "all the male inhabitants, capable "of fatigue," were ordered to "be immediately employed on the fortifications of the City, and as well "all the negro men in the City and County of New "York" were similarly ordered; and, at the same time, the inhabitants of Kings-county were ordered to be similarly employed on the defences of that County; while levies were made on the southern part of Orange, or what now constitutes Rockland, County, and on the County of Westchester, for detachments from the Militia of those Counties, respectively, for the support and assistance of the working parties in the City of New York.[2]

That portion of the *Regulations*, thus agreed to between General Lord Stirling and the Committee of the Provincial Congress, which related particularly to Westchester-county, is in the following words:

"*7thly.* Resolved and Ordered, That Colonel "Joseph Drake and Colonel Thomas Thomas, of "Westchester-county, do draft out of their Regiments "two hundred men, in the following proportions, to "wit; Two Companies of sixty-five Privates each, "besides the Captains and other inferior Officers, out "of Colonel Joseph Drake's Regiment, and one Com-"pany of sixty-five Privates, with the Captain and "other inferior Officers, of Colonel Thomas's Regiment, "and as many more men out of those two Regiments "as will turn out, Volunteers for that service, to be im-"mediately sent to the City of New York, armed and "accoutred in the best manner possible, and to be "joined to Colonel Samuel Drake's Regiment, and to "receive the same pay and provisions as the other "Continental forces in this Colony."

As what was called the Regiment of Westchester-county Minute-men, commanded by Colonel Samuel Drake,[3] was then at Hoern's Hook, opposite Hell-gate, it will be seen that Westchester-county was largely depended on; but no record has been found which indicates which of the Companies of the Militia of that County were thus drafted and sent to throw up the defensive works within the City of New York, nor is it now known who, if any, of the farmers of that County, volunteered their services, for that laborious duty.

As has been already stated, early attention was paid by the Provincial Congress to the subject of the election of Deputies to a new Congress and to that of its own dissolution. To that end, on the sixteenth of December, 1775, the Congress adopted the following Resolution:

"Resolved, That the Committee of Safety be and "hereby are fully empowered to issue orders to the "respective Counties in this Colony, to elect Deputies "for a Provincial Congress of this Colony, to meet "on the second Tuesday in May next. The said "Committee, by their Order, appointing the day of "Election, in each County, to be at least twenty-one "days before the said second Tuesday in May next."[4]

Notwithstanding that *Resolution*, there appears to have been some other "plan for the election of Depu-"ties to form a Provincial Congress to meet when the "present Provincial Congress will expire." It is not now known what that other "plan" embraced nor by whom it was introduced or supported; but it was evidently intended to limit the right of voting for Deputies to the new Congress, to those who had signed the *Association*, and to have the vote taken by ballot. It appears, also, to have been resolutely and successfully opposed, at least as far as the limitation of the right of suffrage was included in its provisions; and its evidently radical supporters, after their defeat on that portion of the "plan," abandoned the project for an election by ballot.[5] The entire subject was then referred to a Committee, for further consideration; and, on the afternoon of the same day, after the said "plan" had been "read, and again read, "paragraph by paragraph, amended, and corrected." it is said to have been "approved," subject, however, to a further consideration, on the following morning.[6]

[1] *Journal of the Provincial Congress*, "Die Mercurii, 10 ho., A.M., "March 13, 1776."

[2] *Journal of the Provincial Congress*, "Die Jovis, 4 ho., P.M., March 14, "1776."

[3] Vide pages 152, 153, ante.

[4] *Journal of the Provincial Congress*, "Die Sabbati, 10 ho., A.M., Decr. "16, 1775."

[5] *Journal of the Provincial Congress*, "Die Lunæ, 10 ho., A.M., March "11, 1776."

[6] *Journal of the Provincial Congress*, "Die Lunæ, 1 ho., P.M., March 11, "1776."

The obscurity of the *Journals* of the second Provincial Congress, on the subject under consideration, is relieved, to some extent by the *Journals* of the third of those Congresses in an occasional reference to the subject.

Besides that almost unintelligible entry in the *Journals of the Provincial Congress*, no mention appears to have been made on the subject, if any thing further was done with it. It is probable, however, that an Election was ordered to be made for Deputies, on the third Tuesday, which was the sixteenth day, of April;[1] and that the fourteenth day of May was designated for the meeting of the new Provincial Congress.[2]

The Provincial Congress itself appears to have been disbanded, informally—its *Journal* makes no mention of a formal adjournment—on the afternoon of Monday, the thirteenth of May, 1776;[3] and, thus the second Provincial Congress of the Colony of New York and its doings, for evil or for good, became subjects for the pens of those who should thenceforth assume the grave and responsible duties of historians.

We mentioned, in another part of this narrative,[4] the election of "a Committee for the County of West-"chester," on the eighth of May, 1775, and the appointment of Gilbert Drake for its Chairman, and Micah Townsend for its Clerk. It appears that, either by pre-determined limitation or otherwise, the term of service of that County Committee expired in May, 1776; and, in order that the succession of that body might be continued, notice to that effect having been given, on the sixteenth of April, 1776, "a Number "of the Freeholders and Inhabitants of Westchester-"county appeared at the Court House," and "chose "the Persons hereafter named to serve as a Committee "for the said County from the 2nd Monday in May, "1776, to the 2nd Monday in May, 1777—any twenty "whereof to be a Quorum, vizt:

"For Morrisania.
"LEWIS MORRIS, JUNr. —1.

"For Westchester.
"THOMAS HUNT,
"ABRAHAM LEGGETT,
"ISRAEL HONEYWELL,
"JOHN OAKLEY,
"GILBERT OAKLEY,
"DANIEL WHITE,
"JOHN SMITH—7.

"For Yonkers.
"WILLIAM HADLEY,
"WILLIAM BEITS,
"THOMAS EMMONS,
"JOHN CRAWFORD,
"FRED. V. CORTLANDT —5.

For Eastchester.
STEPHEN SNEDEN,
EDWARD BRIGGS,
DANIEL SEBRING—3.

For New Rochelle and Pelham.
[The original Ms. hard to read.]
MYERS,
GUION,
WILLIS,
LIP WELL, JUNr.—4.

For Mamaroneck.
GIL*BUDD HORTON—1.

"For Philipsburg.
"ISRAEL HONEYWELL, JUNr.
"ABRAHAM STORM,
"PETER VAN TASSELL,
"GLODE REQUEAU,
"ABRm LEDEW,
"JAMES HAMMOND,
"JOSEPH YOUNGS,
"GERSHOM SHERWOOD,
"JAMES REQUEAU,
"THOMAS CHAMPENOIS, —10.

"For W. Plains.
"BENJAMIN LYON,
"JOSHUA HATFIELD—2.

"For Scarsdale.
"SAMUEL CRAWFORD—1.

"For H. Precinct.
"THOMAS THOMAS,
"Wm. MILLER,
"ISAIAH MAYNARD—3.

"For North Castle.
"MICHAEL HAYS,
"PETER LYON,
"JACOB PURDY,
"ANDREW SNIFFIN,
"GILBERT PALMER,
"CALEB MERRITT, JUNr.
"CALEB CARPENTER—7.

For Rye.
SAMUEL TOWNSEND,
ISRAEL SEAMAN,
FRED. SAY,
SAMUEL LYON,
GILBERT LYON,
JOHN THOMAS, JUNr—6.

For Bedford.
ELIJAH HUNTER,
JOHN WOOLSEY,
TITUS MILLER,
ISRAEL LYON—4.

For Poundridge.
JOSH LOCKWOOD—1

For Salem.
ABIJAH GILBERT—1.

For Cortlandts Manor.
JOSEPH TRAVIS,
DANIEL BIRDSALL,
SAMUEL DRAKE,
ABRAHAM PURDY,
NATHANIEL HYATT,
JOSEPH LEE,
EBENEZER PURDY,
ISAAC NORTON,
HALSEY WOOD—9.

For Rycks Patent.
HERCULES LENT, 1 — Total 66."[5]

Of this second County Committee, John Thomas, Junior, of Rye, was made the Chairman, and Edward Thomas was appointed its Clerk.

The day after the dissolution of the second Provincial Congress, [*May* 14, 1776,] was the day which had been appointed for the organization of the third of that series of Congresses.[6] There was, however, on that day and on the four succeeding days, an insufficient number of members of the several Deputations to form a quorum of the Counties; but, on the fifth day, [*May* 18, 1776,] the Counties of New York, Richmond, Suffolk, Westchester, Kings, Charlotte, and Tryon—those of Albany, Queens, Ulster, Gloucester, Cumberland, Duchess, and Orange were either entirely unrepresented or were without the requisite numbers to make their several Deputations complete—assumed the consistent, counter-revolutionary responsibility of organizing the Congress and of proceeding to transact business.[7] It continued in session, without tak-

[1] The elections in the Counties of New York, Westchester, Duchess, Kings, Queens, Tryon, Ulster, and Orange were held on that day; while Albany-county appears to have elected her Deputies on the 25th; Suffolk, on the 18th; Richmond-county, on the 23rd; and Charlotte-county, on the 1st May.

[2] *Journal of the Provincial Congress*, "Die Martis, 10 ho., A.M., May "14, 1776."

[3] *Journal of the Provincial Congress*, "Die Luna, 3 ho., P.M., May 13 "1776."

[4] Vide pages 82, 83, 91, ante.

[5] *Members of a Committee for Westchester-county—Historical Manuscripts*, etc.; *Miscellaneous Papers*, xxxviii., 309.

[6] *Journal of the Provincial Congress*, "Die Martis, 10 ho., A.M., May "14, 1776."

[7] *Journal of the Provincial Congress*, "Die Sabbati, 10 ho., A.M., May "18, 1776."

Ulster, Gloucester, and Cumberland-counties were entirely unrepresented; instead of the requisite *three*, only Messrs. Cuyler and Glenn appeared from Albany county; instead of the requisite *three*, only Messrs. Blackwell and Lawrence appeared from Queens-county; instead

ing any recess, until the thirtieth of June, when, because of supposed danger, in the City of New York, it adjourned to meet at the White Plains, on the following Tuesday, [*July* 2, 1776];[1] but the *Journals* very clearly indicate that no such adjourned meeting was attempted—the Deputies had more important business requiring their personal attention; and the third Congress was permitted to pass away, without further ceremony.

The third Provincial Congress was distinguished by the entrance into it, among the Deputies from the City and County of New York, of John Jay, James Duane, John Alsop, Philip Livingston, and Francis Lewis, notwithstanding all of them were, also, Delegates from the Colony to the Continental Congress, then in session, in Philadelphia; and because three of those five are now known to have resisted the earlier movements toward Independence, in that Congress,[2] and to have, also, resisted the later movements in that direction, in the Provincial Congress, it is a reasonable conclusion that the hegira of those three, if not that of the whole number, had been made for the purpose of obstructing the adoption of that increasingly popular measure, as well as that of the establishment of a new form of government, through the Provincial Congress of New York, at least long enough to enable the Royal Commissioners for effecting a reconciliation with the Colonies, who were then approaching New York, to exhibit their powers and their inclinations, in that better desired measure. How successfully the scheme was carried out, in the latter body, will be seen, hereafter.

* * * * *

The deputation from Westchester-county to that third Provincial Congress, said to have been "duly "elected to represent the said County in Provincial "Congress for twelve months, with such powers and "authority as was recommended in the Resolutions "of the late Provincial Congress to be given them, "any three of whom to be a quorum," were Colonel Pierre Van Cortlandt, Colonel Lewis Graham, Colonel Gilbert Drake, Major Ebenezer Lockwood, Gouverneur Morris, William Paulding, Jonathan G. Tompkins, Samuel Haviland, and Peter Fleming.[3]

During the less than two months which intervened between the organization and the untimely dissolution of that third Provincial Congress, [*May* 18 *to June* 30, 1776.] the Northern Army was effectually driven from Canada; and all which had been promised and hoped for, in that very well planned, but premature and expensive, expedition, produced nothing else than disappointment and disaster, the latter as serious to those of the resident Canadians who had favored the invading Colonists, as it was to the latter. In South Carolina, the superior bravery of Colonel Moultrie and his handful of Carolinians, even when hampered by the superior authority but inferior practical knowledge of General Lee, had secured lasting honor to himself and to his gallant command and renewed safety to his own country; and "though not "of much magnitude, in itself, it was, like many "other successes attending the American Arms, in "the commencement of the War, of great importance "in its consequences: by impressing on the Colonists "a conviction of their ability to maintain the con-"test, it increased the number of those who resolved "to resist British authority and assisted in paving "the way to a declaration of Independence." The Continental Congress had yielded to the teachings of its experience, and directed enlistments to be made for three years, instead of for six months; but "that "zeal for the service which was manifested in the "first moments of the War, had long begun to abate; "and though the determination to resist became more "general, that enthusiasm which prompts individuals, "voluntarily, to expose themselves to more than "equal shares of the danger and hardships to be en-"countered for the attainment of a common good, "was sensibly declining"—in other words, there were more of those who were willing that somebody

---

of the requisite *three*, only Mr. Schenck appeared from Duchess-county; and of the requisite *two* from Orange-county, only Mr. Little appeared.

[1] *Journal of the Provincial Congress*, "Sunday morning, June 30, "1776."

Mr. Bolton, (*History of Westchester-county*, original edition, ii., 359; *the same*, second edition, ii., 564,) said of the imaginary journey of the Deputies, from the City of New York to the White Plains, between the adjournment of the Congress and the day on which it was to be re-assembled, "The journey between New York and the Plains was per-"formed by the members on horseback, Pierre van Cortlandt, the Presi-"dent, riding at their head. As expresses overtook them from General "Washington, the House was called to order, on horseback, and several "Resolutions passed."

As has been already stated, there was not the slightest attempt made to keep up the organization of the Congress, after its hurried and informal dissolution, on that eventful Sunday; that there was, therefore, no such funereal procession as Mr. Bolton has described, nor any such official acts, on horseback or on foot, as he has imagined; and that there was no such meeting of the Provincial Congress, at the White Plains, on Tuesday, the second of July, as he has left his readers to suppose.

As Mr. Bolton has not named any authority for his statement, although he was not the first to print it, he must be regarded as authorially responsible for it; and, therefore, it may be proper to say, further, that Pierre Van Cortlandt was not the President of the Congress, nor had he been such, at any time, General Woodhull having been elected its President, and John Haring, of Orange-county, occupied the Chair, as President *pro tem.*, on the last day of its session. In the same connection, it may be said that, although Colonel Pierre Van Cortlandt was elected as one of the Deputies from Westchester-county to the third Provincial Congress, that under notice, he never occupied a seat in it, even for a single day.

[2] The Resolution of July 2, 1776, separating the Colonies from the Mother Country, was not the earliest declaration of Independence, in the Colonies, by any means. The correspondence of John Adams is well filled with evidence of his correct judgment of the real character of the earlier enactments of the Continental Congress; but the Resolution which was introduced into that Congress, early in May, 1776, and adopted on the tenth of that month, and the Preamble to that Resolution, which was adopted on the fifteenth, recommending the adoption of new forms of Government, in the several Colonies, was, assuredly, nothing else than a Resolution of Independence, thinly disguised by the prefix of another name.

[3] *Journal of the Provincial Congress*, "Die Sabbati, 10 ho., A.M., May "18 1776."

else than themselves should do whatever fighting might become necessary; but, on the other hand, those who were expected to do the fatigue duty and to hazard their lives, had begun to see that the offices and the benefits to be derived from their expected labor and exposure were to be converted mainly to the benefit of others; and their enthusiasm for "the "Rights of Man and of Englishmen," which was formerly proclaimed by multitudes of earnest men, with scarcely one holding back, was, also, "sensibly "declining," as Marshall has aptly said—indeed, enlistments were made only among those who were desperately poor or among those whose moral characters were not unstained; and even these had to be bribed by bounties, that certain indication that something else than simple, unadulterated patriotism inspired the act. General Washington was at New York, with the main body of the Continental Army, strengthening the defences and seeking means to prevent the passage of ships of war up the Hudson-river or, through the East-river, into the Sound; urging the increase of his Army on those who did no more than call on others, as unwilling as themselves, to enter the ranks; and begging for Arms and munitions of War, of which he was almost destitute, from those who had neither Arms nor munitions of War to bestow on him nor on any other. A large body of Militia, as will be seen, hereafter, was ordered into the field, for the support of the Army, to be mustered in until the close of the year; a "Flying Camp," so called, was ordered to be composed of ten thousand men from Pennsylvania, Delaware, and Maryland; and, on every hand, were seen the active preparations, by an unwilling and bounty-bought or poverty-driven Army, to settle the dispute in which it possessed no direct, if any, interest, by the arbitrament of Arms.

During that brief period, also, the movements of some of those who had assumed to be the leaders of the masses, throughout the several Colonies, were more frequent and more decided in their tone, in favor of Independence—movements, however, both within and without the Congress of the Continent, and more especially from the Delegations from New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, and Maryland, which encountered the most determined and vigilant opposition. It were useless to pretend, with any respect for the truth, that the great body of the inhabitants of the Colonies was favorably inclined to or particularly interested in, a change in those who ruled them or in the manner of that rule, since it was perfectly evident that they would not be permitted to exercise any greater political authority nor to have their labors lessened nor their wants better supplied, under one than under the other form of Government; or, in New York, under the administration of the Livingston *régime* instead of that of the De Lancey, under the last of which they had hitherto lived; but the leaders of the Rebellion, elsewhere than in New York, seeing before them a semblance of greater consequence to themselves, in the proposition for Independence, were rapidly concentrating their efforts to accomplish that end. The desire for such a change was, also, sometimes promoted by the consciousness, among those whose consciences had not become charred by their hankering for offices, of that evident hypocrisy in pretending to an earnest loyalty toward a monarch against whom they were waging an open and recognized public War, with which the Committees and the Congresses of the Rebellion had continued to affront the common sense and the morality of Christendom; and that moral inclination to Independence, and those other inclinations, in the same direction, which were prompted by less holy influences, were all strengthened by the alarm which was produced by information that the Colonies had been formally declared to be in rebellion; that mercenaries had been employed to assist in reducing them to subjection, in which all classes would be subjected to a common ruin—a repetition, on a larger scale, but on the other side, of what had been done, already, by the leaders of the Rebellion, in New York, against the peaceful, agricultural inhabitants of Westchester and Duchess and Queens and Richmond-counties; that the Indians were to be employed by the Home-Government, for the purpose of harassing the frontiers and threatening the inland settlements and villages; and that the Slaves were to be withdrawn from their masters, as far as possible, and armed in the service of the King. All these influences had culminated in the submission to the Continental Congress of a Resolution, "That "these United Colonies are, and of right ought to be, "free and independent States, that they are absolved "from all allegiance to the British Crown, and that "all political connection between them and the State "of Great Britain is, and ought to be, totally dis-"solved. That it is expedient forthwith to take the "most effectual measures for forming foreign Al-"liances. That a plan of Confederation be prepared "and transmitted to the respective Colonies for their "consideration and approbation." It encountered, however, the most serious opposition, among which the Livingstons and their supporters, Delegates from New York, were peculiarly conspicuous; and, when the third Provincial Congress came to its untimely end, it was still pending, that Delegation, as far as the paucity of its numbers went, appearing conspicuously among those who were not its supporters.

While these various important matters were occupying the attention of the Colonists, General Howe came into the harbor of New York, and occupied Staten-island with his entire command; and the inhabitants of Richmond-county, as that beautiful island was then called, politically, and as it is still called, as might have been reasonably expected since they were still smarting under the sen-

tence of outlawry and the consequent outrages to which they had been recently subjected by the Provincial Congress and its Committee of Safety, received the new-comers, it is said, "with great de-"monstrations of joy, took the Oaths of Allegiance to "the British Crown; and embodied themselves, under "the authority of the" [*Colonial*] "Governor, Tryon, "for the defense of the Island. Strong assurances were "also received from Long Island and the neighboring "parts of New Jersey, of the favorable disposition of "the people to the Royal Cause," it was said; and those who had been harried from their homes, and who had sought refuge in the swamps and thickets of the country, victims of the rapine and outrages of lawless and ruthless "patriots," their own countrymen, quite reasonably, hastened to seek the protection of those by whom, under a more judicious policy, they would be enabled to occupy their own homes and to pursue the ordinary routine of their peaceful lives, in quietude and safety. A large and well-provided force, for the reinforcement of General Howe's command, was known to be on the ocean and not distant, convoyed by a strong naval force, under the command of Admiral Howe—the latter a brother of the General and, with him, a half brother of the King—and it was already known that, thenceforth, New York would be the base of all the military and naval operations, on the Atlantic seaboard, in the next campaign.

On the day after the King's forces came into the harbor, [*June* 30, 1776,] after it had provided for the removal "of all and singular the public papers and "money" which were then in the possession of its Secretary and its Treasurer, to the White Plains, the Provincial Congress was hastily adjourned to that place, as has been already stated, in order that it might escape from the possibly sudden attack on the City, by the Royal forces—an attack by them, on the seat of the local Government of the Rebellion in the Colony of New York, and that at an early day, having evidently been a feature in the pre-constructed plans of General Howe. The anxious Provincial Congress resolved, however, that it would re-assemble at the Court-house, at the White Plains, on the following Tuesday, the second of July, to resume its official business, which was thus interrupted by the appearance, in the distance, of danger; and it resolved, also, that the next Provincial Congress should meet at the same place, on the succeeding Monday, the eighth of July.

In the brief Session which was thus interrupted, and which was not continued, at the White Plains or elsewhere, the third Provincial Congress continued the injudicious and unjust, to say nothing of the barbarous, outrages inflicted on those who were not inclined to accede to every measure of the Congresses and Committees, no matter how passive those Colonial Non-jurors of America might have been; and those pains and penalties were inflicted, directly, by its own authority;[1] and indirectly, by the several local Committees;[2] the Congress, meanwhile, acquiescing in, if not approving, the most barbarous treatment of its prisoners;[3] winking at the barbarities practised by mobs, on those whom it had proscribed;[4]

---

[1] *Journal of the Provincial Congress*, "Die Martis, P.M., May 28, 1776;" *the same*, "Die Jovis, 9 ho., A.M., May 30, 1776;" *the same*, "Die Martis, "9 ho., A.M., June 4, 1776;" *the same*, "Die Jovis, 9 ho., A.M., June "6, 1776;" etc.

[2] *Journal of the Provincial Congress*, "Die Lunæ, 4 ho., P.M., June 3, "1776;" *the same*, "Die Jovis, 9 ho., A.M., June 6, 1776;" *the same*, "Thursday morning, June 20, 1776;" *the same*, "Friday afternoon, "June 21, 1776;" etc.

[3] Henry Dawkins, accused of counterfeiting, was ironed so heavily, *within the prison*, that he was reported to have been "injured by his irons "so that his legs swell;" and Henry Youngs, accused of the same offense, also confined in the Jail, was so much injured by the irons with which he was additionally secured, that it became necessary to remove them. (*Journal of the Provincial Congress*, "Friday morning, 9 ho., A.M., "June, 1776;" *the same*, "Tuesday morning, New York, June 11, "1776.")

[4] About the middle of June, 1776, mobs were raised by John Lasher, John and Joshua Hett Smith, Peter Van Zandt, and other leaders of the extreme revolutionary faction, in the City of New York, by whom several citizens who were of the Opposition, but not of the Rebellion, were seized by these revolutionary "patriots," who placed them on "sharp "rails," and carried them on men's shoulders, around the City, amidst the huzzas of the mob. The progress of one of these parties was said to have been stopped by General Putnam; but not until the victim had sustained serious injuries, (Jones's *History of New York during the Revolutionary War*, i., 101–103; de Lancey's *Notes* on Jones's *History*, i., 596–598.)

Peter Elting, a brother-in-law of Richard Varick, wrote of these transactions, "We had some Grand Toory Rides in this City this week & in par-"ticular yesterday. Several of them were handeld verry Roughly Being "Caried trugh the streets on Rails, there Clooths tore from there backs "and there Bodies pritty well mingled with the dust. Amongst them "were C——, Capt. Hardenbrook, Mr. Rapllje, Mr. Queen the Poticary, "and Lessly the barber. There is hardly a toory face to be seen this "morning." (*Peter Elting to Captain Richard Varick*, "NEW YORK, 13th "June, 1776.")

On the twelfth of June, in the afternoon, Generals Putnam and Mifflin, who had evidently witnessed the outrages to which Elting alluded, "complained to the Provincial Congress of the riotous and disorderly "conduct of numbers of the inhabitants of this City, which had led this "day to acts of violence towards some disaffected persons;" but what had shocked Israel Putnam, by reason of its barbarism, even while the "complaint" of those two Officers urged the Congress to condemn the offenders, one of whom was then occupying a seat in the Congress, that body winked at, and, at the same time, it screened the offenders, and qualified the offense—its words were these: "RESOLVED; That this Con-"gress by no means approve of the riots that have happened this day; "they flatter themselves, however, that they have proceeded from a real "regard to Liberty and a detestation of those persons who, by their "language and conduct, have discovered themselves to be inimical to "the cause of America. To urge the warm friends of Liberty to de-"cency and good order, this Congress assures the public that effectual "measures shall be taken to secure the enemies of American Liberty in "this Colony, and do require the good people of this City and Colony to "desist from all Riots, and leave the offenders against so good a cause to be "dealt with by the constitutional representatives of the Colony"—the subsequently infamous "Committee to detect Conspiracies," then in embryo, having been, undoubtedly, the "constitutional" agency referred to, (*Journal of the Provincial Congress*, "Wednesday afternoon, June 12, "1776.")

It has been said, apologetically, that the Congress was intimidated; and that the mob was the controlling power; but the overwhelming military force which was then in the City, with General Washington at its head, indicated no such state of affairs; and it is undoubtedly true that that series of Mobs, directed by leaders of the Rebellion—one of whom, if no more, was a member of the Provincial Congress—against those of the Colonists who were not of the Rebellion, was intended to give to the new-formed "Committee to detect Conspiracies," subsequently so obnoxious to every honorable man, a good set-off in its work of persecution and outrage.

and compelling the latter to seek safety in flight.[1] It assumed judicial functions, in putting some of its victims on "trial," before itself or a Committee of its members;[2] sometimes it graciously absolved those whom it had seized on mere "informations;"[3] and, occasionally, it honored a victim of a local Committee, by listening to an Appeal from the decision of that inferior tribunal,[4] although it was not always exempt from an appearance, at least, of partiality to the Respondent in the Case.[5] In the same connection, it called into existence and inaugurated the "Committee to detect Conspiracies," that powerful inquisitorial agency of the Rebellion, in New York, whose doings will be noticed more fully, hereafter.

* * * * * * * *

Those who had been hoist with their own petard, in becoming the speculative holders of Dutch Tea, which they had smuggled into the Colony, and which they could not, now, dispose of, unless on terms and at prices which would have been disastrous to them, pestered the Provincial Congress with appeals for relief from the enactments of their own friends; and some of them—one of them a member of the preceding Provincial Congresses, and another a Delegate of the Colony in the Continental Congress—were charged with violating those enactments, in their efforts to "work off" some portions of their stocks of the article; but, of course, in such instances as Isaac Sears and John Alsop, the offenders sustained no evil consequences from the exposure of their commercial peccadillos.[6]

There were other subjects, of greater general interest than these, which received the hurried attention of that very busy body of men; and to some of these, places in this narrative may properly be given.

The first of these is that "Committee to detect "Conspiracies," already alluded to, which originated in that much talked-of "Hickey Plot,"—the latter, a partisan bugbear which, before long, will descend to the low level of "the Negro Plot," in the same City of New York, in which the conspiracy against the helpless victims was greater than any which had possibly existed among them, against others; or to the lower level of that "Witchcraft" excitement, in Salem, led by clerical narrowness and bigotry, which had brought so much shame on the Mathers and on Colonial Massachusetts.

Sometime between Monday morning and Tuesday afternoon, [*May* 20, 21, 1776,]—as no entry of its appointment was made on the *Journals of the Provincial Congress*, nothing is known concerning the time nor the circumstances of the appointment, unless from inference[7]—that body appointed a Committee "to consider of the ways and means to prevent the dangers "to which this Colony is exposed by its intestine "enemies." Beyond the single fact that John Alsop, one of the most determined enemies of Independence and subsequently a recognized Loyalist,[8] was a member, if not the Chairman, of that Committee, there is no record of the names of those who constituted it; and, beyond the information which was contained in its title, there is quite as much obscurity surrounding the purposes for which it was created.

On Tuesday afternoon, [*May* 21, 1776.] as we have said, Mr. Alsop submitted the Report of the Committee;[9] and it was duly debated, with several motions for amendments, until the following Friday, [*May*

[1] The Continental Congress having authorized the employment of Continental troops for such a purpose, a Regiment was sent to Hempstead, for the purpose of seizing those who were disaffected to the Rebellion. The proposed victims having been disarmed, by order of the Provincial Congress, during the Winter of 1775-'6, they had no means for their defense, and, therefore, they fled and hid themselves in swamps, in woods, in barns, in hollow trees, in corn-fields, and in the marshes. Numbers took refuge in the pine barrens of Suffolk-county; others, in small boats, kept sailing about the Sound, landing in the night and sleeping in the woods, and taking to the water again in the morning. They were pursued like wolves and bears, from swamp to swamp, from one hill to another, from dale to dale, and from one copse of wood to another. Numbers were taken; some were wounded; and a few were killed—all that, too, on a peaceful, unarmed, passive community; unable to defend itself, because it had been stripped of its arms; in advance of any adverse movement; and only to promote the individual purposes of a handful of ambitious and reckless men: all that, too, in the name of "Liberty" and the "Rights of Man." (*Journal of the Provincial Congress*, "Sunday afternoon, June 30, 1776;" *General Washington to the President of Congress*, "New York, June 28, 1776;" "Jones's *History of New York during the Revolutionary War*, i., 108, 109.)

[2] *Journal of the Provincial Congress*, "Die Lunæ, 9 ho., A.M., May 27, "1776;" *the same*, "Tuesday morning, NEW YORK, June 11, 1776;" *etc.*

[3] *The Provincial Congress to the Committee of Queens-county*, "IN PROVINCIAL CONGRESS, NEW-YORK, A.M., June 11, 1776;" *Journal of the Provincial Congress*, "Thursday morning, June 27, 1776;" *the same*, "Die Mercurii, 9 ho., A.M., June 5, 1776."

[4] *Journal of the Provincial Congress*, "Saturday, P.M., June 1, 1776;" *the same*, "Die Martis, 9 ho., A.M., June 4, 1776;" *the same*, "Die Mercurii, 9 ho., A.M., June 5, 1776;" *the same*, "Die Jovis, 9 ho., A.M., "June 6, 1776;" *the same*, "Die Lunæ, 9 ho., A.M., June 10, 1776."

[5] In the Appeal of Thomas Harriot from the decision of the General Committee of the City and County of New York, *the latter of whom was, also, very evidently the Complainant in the original Case*, on the sixth of June, the Provincial Congress, without any application from either party, voluntarily offered to give its aid to the Respondent, "for the attendance of "their witnesses," leaving the Appellant without any such favor. As might have been foreseen, in such an instance of pre-entertained partiality in the Appellate body, the decision which the General Committee had made in its own Case, was sustained by the Provincial Congress; and the Appeal therefrom, of Thomas Harriot, was promptly dismissed.

[6] *Journal of the Provincial Congress*, "Die Mercurii, 9 ho., A.M., May "29, 1776;" *the same*, "Friday Afternoon, June 14, 1776."

See, also, *the Provincial Congress to the Delegates in the Continental Congress*, "IN PROVINCIAL CONGRESS, NEW YORK, July 28, 1775," and the "really anxious" *reply of James Duane, John Alsop, John Jay, Robert R. Livingston, Junior, and Francis Lewis*, "PHILADELPHIA, 20th Sept. 1776;" *General Washington to the Provincial Congress*, "NEW-YORK, 13 May, 1776," enclosing a letter from Isaac Sears, concerning those who were undersolling their teas; and what shall be, hereafter, said on the subject.

[7] John Alsop did not take his seat in the Provincial Congress until Monday morning, May 20th; but on Tuesday afternoon, May 21st, he presented the Report of the Committee to the Congress. The Committee, of which he was evidently the Chairman, must have been created during that brief interval.

[8] See his letter, resigning his seat in the Continental Congress, because of the Declaration of Independence, "PHILADELPHIA, 16 July, "1776," and Jones's *History of New York during the American Revolution*, i., 35.

[9] *Journal of the Provincial Congress*, "Die Martis, 4 ho., P.M., May 21, "1776."

24, 1776,] when it was approved, not, however, without several very important omissions, if the record of the approved Report may be relied on.[1] In its amended form, the Report was in the following words:

"Your Committee do report: That there is great "reason to believe that the enemies of American Lib-"erty have a general communication with each other "through this and part of the neighbouring Colonies, "by reason whereof the influence of the British Gov-"ernment is much extended and the minds of the "people poisoned by false reports and suggestions.

"That many ill-disposed people have lately resorted "unto, and a great number dwell in, the southern and "eastern parts of Queens-county; that there are also "several ill-disposed persons in the City and County "of New York, and in Kings County, and in sundry "other parts of this Colony, many of whom will most "probably take up arms on the part of our foes, when-"ever they shall see a prospect of success.

"That from the various reports and the best intel-"ligence which can be obtained from Europe, as also "from the positive assertions of the disaffected through-"out this and the neighbouring Colonies, and from "such of their measures as have come to the knowl-"edge of your Committee, there is no room to doubt "that a large hostile armament will soon arrive in "this Colony.

"That the greater part of those who now hold Of-"fices and Commissions under the Crown, and many "others who are generally reputed inimical to Amer-"ican Liberty, will be liable to suffer injuries from "the resentment of the people,[2] and the Colony in "general exposed to great danger from the active ex-"ertions of those among us who are determined to "assist in the subjection of America.

"Your Committee are, therefore, of opinion that, "as well out of regard to the safety of individuals as "for the general welfare of America, it is highly and "indispensably necessary to take speedy and effectual "measures to prevent the hostile intentions of our "foes, to stop the channels of intelligence and com-"munication among the disaffected, and to quell the "spirit of opposition which hath hitherto prevailed.

"Your Committee do propose that, for these pur-"poses, the following persons be apprehended by the "assistance of the Continental troops, now stationed "in and near this City, to wit,

[*The names were not entered on the Journals.*]

"That a Committee be appointed to confer with the "Commander-in-chief, now here, upon the subject of "apprehending the persons above-named, and to su-"perintend the taking of them. That upon and after "the apprehension of the said persons, such of them as "shall give good and sufficient security, on oath, and "otherwise, as the said Committee shall think proper, "that they will not be concerned in any measures "taken or to be taken against the United American "Colonies, or any or either of them, and that they "will discover all measures taken or to be taken "against the said Colonies, or any or either of them, "as far as the same shall come to their knowledge, re-"spectively be permitted to go at large; and that as "to such persons as shall refuse such security, it shall "be in the discretion of the said Committee to admit "on their parol of honour, to be given to the said "Committee or to the Continental Congress, as many "of the said persons as may, in the judgment of the "said Committee, safely be trusted on their said "parol, to reside in some part of one of the neigh-"bouring Colonies, such as shall be chosen by the "said respective persons, and approved by the said "Committee; and that all such persons as, in the "opinion of the said Committee, cannot safely be "trusted on their said parol, or if to be trusted shall "refuse to give such parol, shall be reported to this "Congress, to be severally dealt with, as this Congress "shall think proper.

"That it be recommended to all the General County "Committees, in the several Counties in this Colony, "to apprehend all persons holding Military Commis-"sions under the King of Great Britain, and also all "such persons holding Civil Offices under the said "King, or, being possessed of influence in their re-"spective Counties, as are suspected of holding prin-"ciples inimical to the said United Colonies; and "after they shall have apprehended, to deal with them "in such manner as is prescribed for the conduct of "the Committee above named.

"All which is, nevertheless, most humbly sub-"mitted.

"JOHN ALSOP, *Chairman*."[3]

When that Report was presented, read, and approved, there were, throughout Westchester-county, the entire body of officers of the Colonial Militia, including some of the members of the Van Cortlandt and other leading families; the entire number of the King's Justices of the Peace; the entire bodies of the Court of Sessions and Court of Common Pleas, at the

[1] On Tuesday afternoon, on motion of Mr. Sands, Richmond-county was ordered to be named as one which was especially proscribed; and on motion of John Morin Scott, an oath of some kind was ordered to "be "extended to all such as refused to sign the *Association*," to which only Gouverneur Morris, to his honor be it said, objected. On Wednesday morning, an attempt to authorize the seizure and detention of residents of Queens-county, as hostages, to secure the submission of those who were left within that County, was rejected, only Westchester and Tryon-counties having supported the proposition. "Sundry other amendments "having been made therein," an attempt to commit the mutilated paper to its parent Committee, to re-model it, was rejected. It is evident, from the final entry on the subject, that other important changes had been made during a session of the Congress, on Thursday evening; but the *Journal* of that Session makes no mention of any action on that subject; and on Friday morning, the amended Report, from which many peculiarly obnoxious features had been removed, was adopted.

[2] The connection of the Mobs, in the City of New-York, already referred to, with the purposes of the authors of this enactment, is distinctly seen, in these words.

[3] *Journal of the Provincial Congress*, "Die Veneris, 9 hor., A. M., May 24, "1776."

head of the last-named of which was John Thomas, who is already known to the reader as, also, one of the members of the former General Assembly and as the head of that prolific family of office-holders bearing that Welsh surname; and the entire body of County Officers, including those of the Prerogative Court, the Sheriff, the County Clerk, etc. All these, together with those who were especially obnoxious and all those whose social standing did not warrant the admission of them into the first class, were to be apprehended—the more prominent by detachments of the Continental Army, the less prominent by the County Committee—and "dealt with," after a "manner" which was "prescribed for the conduct" of those under whose directions the several "apprehensions" should be made. No overt act was charged against any one: it was sufficient that "suspicions" were entertained by some one in revolutionary authority, that one of the inhabitants of the County, no matter whom, was "holding principles inimical to the "said United Colonies," whatever those "principles" might have been; and the unfortunate victim, for nothing else than his opinions' sake, was liable to be exiled or subjected to any other penalty, personal or pecuniary or both, as his captors, unrestrained by any Statute or any enactment of the revolutionary authorities, should incline to impose on him. It is not stated in the annals of that period, however, that either Major Philip Van Cortlandt or Judge John Thomas or any other of those officeholders under the Crown who were also officeholders or supporters of the Revolutionary party, sustained any injury from the provisions of that enactment.

Although there is no entry on the *Journal of the Provincial Congress* which makes mention of the creation of such a Committee, it is very evident the Committee was appointed, with instructions "to report a "Law or 'set of Resolutions of this Congress, to "'prevent the dangers to which this Colony is ex-"'posed by its internal enemies,'" since, on the twenty-eighth of May, such a Committee made a Report to the Congress, through John Morin Scott, who was probably its Chairman. It is not shown what that Report provided for; but Richmond-county voted against it,[1] which may afford some evidence of the character of the paper, since that County and Queens-county were always the especial objects of the resentment of those who were in rebellion, a feeling, as far as Richmond-county was concerned, which was amply reciprocated within the succeeding six weeks.

The work of proscription did not cease with the action of the Congress which has been already referred to. On the fifth of June, in the unexplained words of the *Journal* of that body, "the Congress proceeded to "hear the Resolutions relative to persons dangerous "and disaffected to the American cause and to per-"sons of equivocal character." There is not the slightest allusion to the origin of the Resolutions; but it is very probable they proceeded from the Committee of which John Morin Scott was the mouthpiece, to whom allusion has been made in the preceding paragraph; and, possibly, they may be the Report therein referred to. Notwithstanding the great length of these Resolutions, the notice which was taken of Westchester-county and of Westchester-county interests, in their several provisions, render it necessary that they shall find a place in this narrative. They were in these words:

"WHEREAS the Continental Congress, by their Re-"solve of the sixth day of October last, did recom-"mend to the several Provincial Assemblies, and "Conventions, and Councils or Committees of Safety, "to arrest and secure every person in their respective "Colonies, whose going at large might, in their opin-"ion, endanger the safety of the Colony or the lib-"erties of America:

"AND WHEREAS, from sundry informations and "evidences exhibited to this Congress, it appears "that the enemies of American Liberty, in this and "the neighbouring Colonies, have a general com-"munication with each other, by reason whereof "the influence of the British Ministry, however "feeble, is, in some measure, sustained, and the "minds of the people frequently alarmed and poi-"soned by false reports and misrepresentations, pur-"posely framed and propagated with design to pro-"mote the views and machinations of the enemies of "America.

"AND WHEREAS certain persons in Queens-county, "Kings-county, the City and County of New York, "Richmond-county, and Westchester-county have "been represented to this Congress as disaffected to "the American cause, and, together with others in "various parts of this Colony who, having little or no "property in it, or regard for its Rights, may be in-"fluenced, by the hope of plunder and confiscation, "to take an active part with our enemies, whenever "it may, in their opinions, be done with success:

"AND WHEREAS, from various reports and the best "intelligence which could be obtained from Europe, "as well as from the positive assertions of the dis-"affected throughout this and the neighbouring Col-"onies, there is great reason to expect that an hostile "armament will soon arrive in this Colony, whereby "it hath become highly expedient and necessary to "provide that the inhabitants of this Colony, while "employed in repelling a foreign invasion, be not "injured or annoyed by domestic enemies:

"RESOLVED, THEREFORE, That the following per-"sons in Queens-county, the City and County of New "York, and Richmond-county, whose conduct has "been represented to this Congress as inimical to the "Cause and Rights of America, and who, if sum-

[1] *Journal of the Provincial Congress*, "Die Martis, 9 ho., A.M., May 28, "1776."

"moned, would probably not appear, but secrete "themselves, be arrested and brought before a Com- "mittee of this Congress, hereinafter nominated and "appointed, to wit:

"*In Queens-county.*—Richd. Hulett, Thos. Cor- "nell, Stephen Hulet, Jos. Beagle, of Rockaway; "John Kendall, at Danl. Thomas's, Flushing; John "Bodin, —— Chase, of Jamaica; John Hulet, of "Oyster Bay; and Isaac Denton, of near Rockaway.

"*In the City and County of New-York.*—Peter Mc- "Lean, Saml. Galsworthy, Francis De La Roach.[1]

"*In Richmond-county.*—Isaac Decker, Abm. Harris, "Ephm. Taylor, and Minne Burger.

"And that the following persons, in the Counties "aforesaid, and in the County of Westchester and "Kings-county, whose conduct has been represented "to this Congress as equally inimical with that of "the former, but who would probably appear on be- "ing summoned, be summoned by the said Committee "to appear before them, at such time and place as "they may appoint; and, in default of appearance, "on proof of the service of the summons, that they "be arrested in like manner as the former, to wit:

[*In the City and County of New-York,*] "Wm. "Newton, Linus King, John B. Dash, Henry Law, "Theop. Hardenbrook, Saml. Burling, John Woods, "Benjn. Williams, Christopher Benson, Wm. Bayard, "Fredk. Rhinelander, Jas. Coggeshall, John Mil- "liner, and Theot. Bache.

"*In Kings-county.*—Theo. Bache and Benjamin "James.

"*In Queens-county.*—Chas. Arden, John Moore, "Senr., and David Beatty, of Hempstead.

"*In Westchester-county.*—Fredk. Phillips, Caleb "Morgan, Nath. Underhill, Saml. Merrit, Peter Corne, "Peter Huggeford, James Horton, Junr., Wm. Sutton, "Wm. Barker, Joshua Purdy, and Absalom Gidney.

"Which said Committee are hereby authorized and "required impartially to inquire and determine "whether any, and which, of the said persons have "afforded aid or sustenance to the British Fleets or "Armies, contrary to the Resolutions of the Conti- "nental Congress or of the Provincial Congress or "Committee of Safety of this Colony, or been active "in dissuading any of the inhabitants of this Colony "from associating for the defence of the United Col- "onies, against the unjust claims and hostile attacks "of the British Parliament; decried the value of the "Continental money, and endeavoured to prevent its "currency, contrary to the Resolutions of the Conti- "nental Congress or Provincial Congress or Com- "mittee of Safety of this Colony; or been concerned "or actually engaged in any schemes to defeat, retard, "or oppose the measures now pursuing by the United "Colonies, for their defence against the tyrannical "and cruel attacks of the British Ministry or their "allies, adherents, or agents.

"That all such of the said persons as shall be "found by the said Committee to be innocent of the "said offences be immediately discharged; and that a "Certificate of such acquittal and of the true light "in which they may respectively appear to the said "Committee, under the hands of the said Committee, "be given to them, the said several persons so acquit- "ted; and that they also report to this Congress, the "names of the persons so acquitted, that the same "may be entered on their Journals and published, to "the end that the reputation of such innocent persons "may not suffer or be injured by their having been so "arrested. PROVIDED, NEVERTHELESS, that if the "said persons so to be acquitted should appear in a "suspicious light to the said Committee, that the said "Committee proceed against them, in the manner "hereinafter prescribed for their conduct against "persons of a suspicious and equivocal character.

"And with respect to all such of the said persons "as the Committee shall find guilty of all or any of "the said offences, the said Committee are hereby "authorized and required to commit to safe custody, "all such of them whose going at large would, in "their opinion, endanger the safety of the Colony or "the Liberties of America; and that they discharge "the remainder of them, on their giving Bond, with "good security, to the President of the Provincial "Congress, for the time being, by name, to cease and "forbear all opposition to the Resolutions and meas- "ures of the Continental Congress or Provincial Con- "gress or Committee of Safety of this Colony, for the "defence of the United Colonies against the unjust "claims and hostile operations of the British Minis- "try to enforce them.

"And in case it should appear to the said Commit- "tee, inexpedient that any of the said persons should "continue to dwell at his usual place of residence, "that, then, they do assign to such person or persons "another place of residence, in this or one of the "neighbouring Colonies, and take his or their parole, "or word of honour, or, if they should not be deemed "sufficient, other security, to abide there and not "leave it, without license from this or a future Con- "gress; and, in case of refusal to give such parole and "security, to commit him or them to safe custody.

"AND WHEREAS it may happen that the said "Committee may be informed of other dangerous "persons, not herein named, whom it would be ex- "pedient and necessary to summon or apprehend:

"RESOLVED, That the said Committee be and they

[1] As an illustration of the *manner* in which people were *secretly* put into danger, at that time, the following instance, relating to these three men is presented:

"An information, signed by Aaron Stockholm, Samuel Prince, John "Bogert, and Thomas Gardner, referred to this Congress by the General "Committee of the City of New-York, charging Peter McClean, Samuel "Galsworthy, Francis Delaroach, and a young man, in military cloth- "ing, of their acquaintance, with uttering sentiments highly inimical "and dangerous to the cause of America, was read and filed.

"ORDERED, That the names be added to the list of dangerous, disaf- "fected persons, to be apprehended," (*Journal of the Provincial Congress,* "Die Jovis, 9 ho., A.M., May 30, 1776.")

"hereby are authorized and required to cause such "persons to be summoned or apprehended, as they "may think proper, and to proceed against them, in "the same manner as is herein before directed, with "respect to the persons herein particularly mentioned.

"And whereas employing detachments of the "Militia of this Colony, in arresting the said persons, "will not only be expensive, but the assembling of "them may alarm the suspicions of the said persons "and their adherents, and, thereby, tend to defeat "the design of these Resolutions; and as the Con-"tinental troops quartered in and near the said three "Counties of New-York, Queens, and Richmond, may "be employed in the said business, with little trouble "to themselves and with greater prospect of success:

"Resolved, therefore, That the said Committee "be and they hereby are authorized to confer with "the Commander-in-Chief of the said troops, and to "request of him such detachments of them as may be "necessary for the purpose aforesaid; and that he "give orders that the said detachments, while so em-"ployed, be under the direction of the said Committee "or of discreet persons to be by them appointed.

"Provided, nevertheless, That the said Com-"mittee are hereby empowered to employ such de-"tachments of the Militia as they may think exped-"ient for the purpose aforesaid.

"And whereas there may be, and doubtless are, "in other Counties of this Colony, divers dangerous "persons at present unknown to this Congress:

"Resolved, That it be recommended to the Com-"mittees of all Counties in this Colony, to be vigilant, "and to use their utmost endeavours, from time to "time, to discover and summon or apprehend them, "in like manner as herein before described with "respect to the persons hereby ordered to be arrested, "and to report their proceedings therein to the Con-"gress of this Colony for the time being.

"And whereas it may often happen that the "Committees of Towns and other districts in a County "may discover many dangerous persons whom it would "be proper, immediately, to secure, in which case an "application to the County Committee would not only "be attended with great delay, but would also afford "such dangerous persons an opportunity to escape:

"Resolved, therefore, That the said Commit-"tees of the different Towns and Districts in the "several Counties in this Colony be and they hereby "are authorized and required to cause all persons "whom they may esteem dangerous and disaffected to "appear before them, either by arrest or summons, as "the said Committees, in their discretion, may think "proper, and take from the said persons respectively, "good and sufficient security to appear before the "General Committee of the County, at such time and "place as they shall order him to attend, and, then "and there, to answer such matters as shall, before "the said General Committee, be alleged against him; "and, on refusal to give such security, to commit to "safe custody the said person or persons so refusing, "until the next meeting of the said General Com-"mittee, with whom the accusation against the said "dangerous and disaffected person or persons ought, "forthwith, to be lodged by the Committee of the "Town or District by whom they may be apprehended, "summoned, or committed, as aforesaid.

"And whereas there is, in this Colony, divers "persons who, by reason of their holding Offices from "the King of Great Britain, from their having neg-"lected or refused to associate with their fellow citi-"zens, for the defence of their common Rights, from "their having never manifested, by their conduct, a "zeal for and attachment to the American cause, or "from their having maintained an equivocal neutral-"ity, have been considered by their countrymen in a "suspicious light, whereby it hath become necessary, "as well for the safety as for the satisfaction of the "people, who, in times so dangerous and critical, are "naturally led to consider those as their enemies who "withhold from them their aid and influence:

"Resolved, That the following persons, who are "generally supposed to come under the above descrip-"tion, to wit:

"*In the City and County of New-York.*—Oliver De "Lancey, Chas. W. Apthorpe, William Smith, John "Harris Cruger, Jas. Jauncey, Junr., Wm. Axtell, "Goldsbrow Banyar, Geo. Brewerton, Chas. Nicoll, "Gerard Walton, Donald McLean, Chas. McEvers, "Benjn. Hugget, Wm. McAdam, John Cruger, Ja-"cob Walton, Robert Bayard, Peter Graham, Peter "Van Schaack, Andrew Elliot, David Mathews, John "Watts, Junr., and Thomas Jones.

"*In Kings-county.*—Augustus Van Cortlandt and "John Rapalje.

"*In Richmond-county.*—Benjamin Seaman and "Christopher Billop.

"*In Queens-county.*—Gabriel Ludlow, Saml. Mar-"tin, Thos. Jones,[1] Archd. Hamilton, David Colden, "Richd. Colden, Geo. D. Ludlow, Whitehead Hicks, "Saml. Clowes, Geo. Folliot, Saml. Doughty, Danl. "Kissam, Gilbt. Van Wyck, John Willett, David "Brooks, Charles Hicks, John Townsend, John Pol-"hemus, Benjn. Whitehead, Thomas Smith, John "Shoals, Nathl. Moore, Saml. Hallett, Wm. Wey-"man, Thos. Hicks, at Rockaway, Benjamin Lester.

"*In Westchester-county.*[2]—Solomon Fowler[3] and "Richard Morris.[4]

[1] Thomas Jones, one of the Associate Judges of the Supreme Court of the Colony, was the author of that exceedingly valuable *History of New York during the Revolutionary War*, to which so many references are made, in this narrative. His wife, Anne, was the third daughter of Chief-justice and Lieutenant-governor James De Lancey, which was largely the ground of his offence before the leaders of the Rebellion.

[2] The smallness of the list of the proscribed in Westchester-county may, probably, be accounted for by the fact that Judge Thomas, and Major Van Cortlandt, and the greater number of the Colonial office-holders, in that County, were masquerading, locally, with the revolutionary party.

[3] Solomon Fowler appears to have been of Eastchester.

[4] Richard Morris was the Judge of the Colonial Court of Admiralty

"And also all such other persons of the like character as the said Committee may think proper to be summoned by the said Committee, to appear before them, at such time and place as they shall appoint, then and there to show cause, if any they have, why they should be considered as friends to the American cause, and as of the number of those who are ready to risk their lives and fortunes in defence of the Rights and Liberties of America, against the usurpation, unjust claims, and cruel oppressions of the British Parliament, which Rights and Liberties and which unjust claims and cruel oppressions are specified and stated in divers *Addresses*, *Petitions*, and *Resolutions* of the present and late Continental Congress, and, in default of appearance, the said Committee, on proof made of the service of the said Summons, are authorized and directed to cause them to be arrested and brought before them, by Warrant, under their hands, directed to any Militia Officer in this Colony, who is hereby directed to execute the same.

"And if, on the appearance and examination of the said persons, it shall appear to the satisfaction of the said Committee that they or any of them are friends to the American cause, that such of them whom they shall so adjudge to be friends, be forthwith discharged, and a Certificate thereof, under the hands of the said Committee, given them, and their names forthwith reported to this Congress, to the end that the same may be entered on their *Journals*, and published, and justice thereby done to their characters and reputations. And it is further

"RESOLVED, That all such of the said persons as the said Committee shall not adjudge and determine to be friends to the American cause, the said Committee be and they hereby are required to treat and dispose of in the following manner, to wit:

"That such of them as may be men of influence in the neighbourhood of the place of their present residence, be removed to such place, in this or a neighbouring Colony, as will deprive them of an opportunity of exerting that influence to the prejudice of the American cause, and respectively bound by their parole or word of honour or other security, at the discretion of the said Committee, neither directly or indirectly to oppose or contravene the measures of the Continental Congress or the Congress of this Colony, and to abide in the place and within the limits so to be assigned them, till the further order of the present or future Provincial Congress or Continental Congress; and in case they shall refuse to give such parole or other security, to commit them to safe custody.

"And as to such of the said persons whose removal, in the judgment of the said Committee, shall not appear necessary, that the said Committee do cause them to be respectively bound with such security, by parole or otherwise, as the said Committee shall deem necessary, neither directly or indirectly to oppose or contravene the measures of the Continental Congress of this Colony. PROVIDED, NEVERTHELESS, that the said Committee shall be and they are hereby authorized, in case they shall, on inquiry, find any or either of the said persons to be so dangerous as that they ought not to be admitted to go at large, to order such of them to be kept in safe custody.

"RESOLVED, That the said Committee and the County Committees keep a just record of all their proceedings, in pursuance of these Resolutions, and report the same, with the substance of the evidence offered to them, for and against the several persons who shall be by them apprehended, summoned, tried, and examined by virtue of the aforegoing Resolutions; and that they have power to send for witnesses and papers.

"RESOLVED, That the said Committee consist of the following gentlemen, to wit: Mr. Morris, Col. Rensen, Mr. John Ten Broeck, Mr. Haring, Mr. Tredwell, Col. Lewis Graham, and Mr. Hallett;[1] and that any five of them be a quorum; and that before they enter on the business herein before assigned them, they and also all such of the County Committees as may be engaged in carrying these

---

the jurisdiction of which extended over Connecticut, New York, and New Jersey. His father had occupied the place, before him; he had occupied it since August 2, 1762; and he was, also, Clerk of the Courts of Nisi Prius and General Jail Delivery. He was a brother of Lewis Morris, the Delegate in the Continental Congress, and of Staats Long Morris, an officer in the Royal Army, and husband of the Dowager Duchess of Gordon; and Gouverneur Morris was his half-brother. He was, also, the grandfather of Lewis G. Morris, of Fordham Heights.

Although he was classed, in these Resolutions, among those who occupied "an equivocal neutrality"—he preferred to retain his hold on the Royal Treasury as long as possible; and the studied denunciation of him, in these Resolutions, was admirably adapted to secure the steady payment of his Salary and Fees, and to secure the family estates, in case the Rebellion should be suppressed—just eight weeks after the presentation of this Report, he was appointed, by the same Provincial Congress who had received and adopted this formidable series of Resolutions, to the Bench of the new-formed revolutionary Court of Admiralty; and, three years subsequently, when John Jay ceased to be Chief-justice of the new State, this Richard Morris was appointed to succeed him, in that honorable and influential position. He held the latter office until September, 1790.

The controlling power among the revolutionary elements, in the Colony as well as in the new-formed State, was not slow to reward the Morris family with offices and emoluments; and the latter was equally watchful of its own interests, in accepting whatever was offered.

[1] Of these, Gouverneur Morris and Lewis Graham were from Westchester-county; Henry Rensen and Joseph Hallett were from the City and County of New York; John Ten Broeck was from Albany-county, John Haring was from Orange-county; and Thomas Tredwell was from Suffolk. Subsequently, as will be seen hereafter, Henry Rensen was excused from serving on the Committee; and John Jay, of the City and County of New York, and John Sloss Hobart, of Suffolk, were added to it. At a still later date, Philip Livingston, of the City and County of New York, was also added; and Leonard Gansevoort, of Albany-county, was substituted for John Ten Broeck. After the Committee had become organized, John Haring retired from it, Thomas Randall, of New York, taking his place. A few days before the Congress was disbanded, Joseph Hallett left the Committee.

"Resolutions into execution severally take an oath, "diligently, impartially, without fear, favour, affec-"tion, or hope of reward, to execute and discharge "the duties imposed on them, by the aforegoing "Resolutions.

"RESOLVED, That the said Committee appoint "such persons as they may think proper, to repair to "the said Counties[1] to inquire for and procure the "witnesses against the persons herein directed to be "arrested or summoned to appear, and give evidence "against the said persons, before the said Committee; "and that the said persons be paid for their trouble at "the rate of fifteen shillings for each day they shall "respectively be employed on that service; and that "the witnesses they may direct to attend, as afore-"said, be paid their reasonable expenses for travelling "charges and subsistence, to be certified and allowed "by the said Committee; which Certificate shall be "a Warrant to the Treasurer of this Congress, to pay "the persons in whose favour such Certificate shall "be given, the sum or sums therein allowed, as afore-"said."[2]

On the fourteenth[3] and fifteenth of June,[4] those who were members of the Committee, took the oath required of them; on the last-named day, John McKesson, who was one, the principal one, of the Secretaries of the Provincial Congress, was made the Secretary of the Committee, also;[5] and, with a full retinue of Assistant-secretaries, Messengers, Door-keepers, and other Officers,[6] on the same day, Philip Livingston, Joseph Hallett, John Jay, Thomas Tredwell, Gouverneur Morris, Lewis Graham, and Leonard Gansevoort—Livingston, Jay, and Gansevoort having been meanwhile added to the Committee—being present, the Committee proceeded to the discharge of the duties which had been laid on it.[7]

This secretly acting, inquisitorial body, of which John Jay was made the Chairman, held secret sessions on the fifteenth, nineteenth, twentieth, twenty-first, twenty-second, twenty-third, twenty-fourth, twenty-fifth, twenty-sixth, twenty-seventh, and twenty-ninth of June,[8] beyond which period we do not propose, at this time, to follow it; and on the following day, when the Provincial Congress itself was disbanded and fled, every member of this mighty Committee, with the single exception of Gouverneur Morris, had, also, left the City.[9] Besides receiving an anonymous information that William Sutton, of Mamaroneck, had been heard to say "that, in case "Independency was declared by the Continental Con-"gress, there were three Colonels in the Service who "would join the Ministerial Party;"[10] and the issue of Summonses to Frederic Philipse, of Yonkers, Richard Morris, of Scarsdale, and Samuel Merritt, of the Manor of Cortlandt, to appear and answer before the Committee, on the third of July; the issue of similar Summonses to Solomon Fowler, of Eastchester, Nathaniel Underhill, of Westchester, and James Horton, Junior, and William Sutton, both of Mamaroneck, to appear and answer, on the fourth of July; the issue of similar Summonses to Peter Corne and Doctor Peter Huggeford, both of Westchester-county, to appear and answer, on the fifth of July; and the issue of similar Summonses to William Barker, Joshua Purdy, and Absalom Gedney, all of Westchester-county, to appear and answer, on the sixth of July,[11] the Committee appears to have done nothing which particularly concerned Westchester-county, during the period now under consideration; and, for the present, its doings are dismissed.[12] It may not be

[1] It appears from the words in the text, that Richmond, Kings, Queens, New York, and Westchester-counties were all which were to be favored with the attention of that revolutionary Inquisition; and, as far as the proceedings of that infamous body have been permitted to be exposed to the scrutiny of honest and earnest inquirers, no evidence appears that residents of other Counties were subjected to its despotic practices.

[2] *Journal of the Provincial Congress*, "Die Mercurii, 9 ho., A.M., June "5, 1776."

There are internal evidences, in the two papers, that the Resolutions which the Provincial Congress had adopted, on the twenty-fourth of May (*page 166, ante*) and those which are now under consideration, were written by the *same* hand; and there is evidence which cannot be misunderstood, that that hand was not John Jay's, as some have supposed, but Gouverneur Morris's. It is true that Doctor Sparks made no mention of the subject, in his *Life of Gouverneur Morris*—it was not his purpose to expose the weaknesses and the wrong-doings of his aristocratic and pretentious subject, but to magnify the man and his doings, and to eulogize them—and all those who have preceded us in narrating the events of that period, have, also, preferred to know nothing of this infamous enactment and of its consequences; but it was really enacted, in New York, for the promotion of the purposes of intended confiscations of individual and family properties; and, unquestionably, Gouverneur Morris was the author of it, and one of the master-spirits in the execution of its provisions.

[3] *Journal of the Provincial Congress*, "Friday Afternoon, June 14, "1776."

[4] *Journal of the Provincial Congress*, "Die Sabbati, A.M., June 15, "1776."

[5] Ibid.

[6] Ibid.

[7] *Minutes of the Committee to Detect Conspiracies*, "Die Sabbati, 12 ho., "June 15, 1776."

[8] *The Minutes of the Committee*, during the brief period which elapsed between the date of its organization and that of the dissolution of the Provincial Congress—which, also, by all parliamentary and statutory law, dissolved the Committee which was only its agent—are scattered, in various places, and generally in manuscript, and unprinted. Of the Minutes of the Meetings referred to in the text—and, in this place, we do not propose to refer to any of subsequent dates—carefully made copies, from the scattered originals, have been examined, in every instance.

[9] Jones's *History of New York during the Revolutionary War*, ii., 296.

On that day, Judge Jones, who had been summoned before the Committee and had come to the City of New York, to answer the Summons, found only Gouverneur Morris; and by the latter, he was paroled and permitted to return to his home, in Queens county.

[10] An anonymous Information, forwarded by John Thomas, Junior, Chairman, "IN COMMITTEE OF SAFETY, WHITE PLAINS, June 23, 1776," among the papers of the Committee, of the same day.

[11] *Minutes of the Committee to Detect Conspiracies*, "Thursday, A.M., "June 27, 1776."

[12] Those who are interested in the methods of this Committee, the subsequently much eulogized Chief-justice of the State of New York and Chief-justice of the United States being the presiding officer, may see the forms of its *Summons* and its *Parole*, in Jones's *History of New York during the Revolutionary War*, ii., 295, 296; the forms of its *Warrants*, in its *Minutes* of June 19, 22, and 24, 1776; and those of its various *Bonds*, in its *Minutes* of June 24, 25, 26, and 27, 1776.

The future eulogists of John Jay and Gouverneur Morris may advan-

improper for us to state, however, that, thirteen days after its sessions were interrupted, in the general panic which was produced by General Howe's arrival, there remained twenty-seven prisoners, confined in the cells in the City Hall, and forty-three, including the Mayor of the City, in those of the new Jail.[1]

It would appear incredible that such a relentless spirit of partisan bitterness could have been entertained, at such a time, in such a body as the Provincial Congress of New York; but the records of the Congress which clearly avowed such bitterness, and those of the Committee which it created for the purpose of executing its malignant enactments, to say nothing of the unwritten and other informal testimony of the terrorism which was at once revived, and the renewed activity, in persecution, of every petty Precinct, District, and Town Committee, all bear ample testimony to the fact that personal animosities and partisan malignity had so entirely overwhelmed the reason and the judgment and the humanity of the aristocratic leaders of the Rebellion, in their haughty demands for uniformity of opinion as well as of practice, in religion as well as in politics,[2] that not even the near approach of an avowed and powerful enemy nor the severely pressing necessity of preparing to receive and to successfully oppose that not distant enemy could check their headlong and reckless work of arousing those, among themselves, victims of their former oppression and plunder and outrage—many of whom, nevertheless, would have remained passive spectators of the struggle—and of forcing them, in retaliation and self-defence, to become earnest and active, if not desperate, belligerents, on the side and in support of the Crown.

As portions of the general subject of proscription, mention may be properly made, in this place, of two or three instances which occurred in Westchester-county.

It appears that it had become the practise of several of the local Committees—those in Westchester-county, in some instances, having been of the number—of sending those who were offensive to them, without the slightest authority, revolutionary or conservative, to the Forts in the Highlands, which were then garrisoned with Continental troops, "with orders "to the commanding Officers to keep them at hard "labor, until further orders," no matter what the disability of the victims to sustain such hardships may have been—a process concerning the propriety of which even General Putnam, who was then the Officer in command of the Army, in the absence of General Washington, entertained some very reasonable and very clearly expressed doubts;[3] and the Provincial Congress, in consequence of those doubts and of other considerations, was constrained to countermand those portions of the commitments to those Forts, which had imposed hard labor on the prisoners.[4]

Another instance of that spirit of persecution was seen in the movement of Egbert Benson, one of those who were controlled more by their haughty and ill-controlled wills than by any enactment of Committee or Congress or by any requirement of personal or political integrity, for the employment of a local force, in the service and pay of the Colony, for the purpose of "keeping the peace and order and to suppress the "disaffected in Duchess-county."[5] The "requisi-"tion," for by that expressive word the call of Benson was then known, was duly referred to the Deputations from Duchess, Westchester, and Ulster-counties, for consideration and report—Gouverneur Morris, Samuel Haviland, Jonathan G. Tompkins, and Lewis Graham, representing Westchester-county;[6] and, on the following day, that Committee recommended the employment of one hundred men in Duchess-county and fifty men in Westchester-county, "the said men "to be raised in the said Counties respectively, and "confined to the service of those Counties, and to "continue in pay until the first day of November "next, unless sooner discharged by this or a future "Congress."[7]

There appears to have been a serious opposition to the adoption of the Report, New York City and County leading in the opposition, but it was, nevertheless, adopted;[8] and, two days afterwards, [*June* 22, 1776,]

---

tageously read, from these *Minutes*, what those distinguished lawyers were capable of doing, judicially, when they were within closed and closely guarded doors; what they, then, regarded as offences before the law; the methods which they adopted, in their inquisitorial process; and what their judgments were and what penalties they inflicted.

With these instances of the capabilities of those two men before us, we have been enabled to understand, more clearly than ever before, some of actions of the Chief Justice and of the Ambassador which, previously, had needed additional explanation.

[1] *List of Prisoners in the City Hall, New York*, July 12, 1776, and *List of Prisoners in the New Gaol*, among the papers of the Committee—*Historical Manuscripts*, etc.: *Miscellaneous Papers*, XXXIV., 190.

[2] It will be remembered that the *opinions* of its victims, on questions of Law, of Legislation, and of Political Economy, were regarded as matters of offence, even where no *act* which was obnoxious had been charged against them; and that, for those *opinions*, only, in many instances, those victims were subjected to punishment. It will be remembered, also, that the leaders of the Rebellion assumed the right of determining when and in what manner religious services should be conducted by the Churches, in the Colonies, and those for whom Churches and individuals should and should not offer their prayers to Almighty God. In Connecticut, every Episcopalian Church, except one, was closed, because the Clergy would not submit to the requirements concerning their prayers to God; and in that single exception, the courageous preacher maintained his relations with his Master, notwithstanding the opposition; and the cowards did not seriously disturb him.

[3] *General Putnam to the Provincial Congress*, "HEAD-QUARTERS, NEW-"YORK, June 3, 1776."

[4] *Journal of the Provincial Congress*, "Die Lunæ, 4 ho., P.M., June 3, "1776."

[5] *Journal of the Provincial Congress*, "Wednesday morning, June 19, "1776;" and *the same*, "Wednesday afternoon, June 19, 1776."

[6] *Journal of the Provincial Congress*, "Wednesday afternoon, June 19, "1776."

[7] *Journal of the Provincial Congress*, "Thursday morning, June 20, "1776."

[8] *Journal of the Provincial Congress*, "Thursday morning, June 20, "1776."

after various manipulations, in a second Committee,[1] by "one of the Secretaries,"[2] and by the Congress itself,[3] the subject was disposed of, in a series of Resolutions, which, it is said, "were unanimously approved of."

As that entire subject relates to the local history of Westchester-county, at that period, and to the establishment of a military police force, in that County, evidently for the more effectual prosecution of the proposed operations of the recently created "Committee to detect Conspiracies" among the peaceable conservative residents of that County—as no complaint had been made, by any one, of the slightest breach of the peace, in that County, and as its local County Committee had made no application for the establishment of such a military police force, for any purpose, there can be no doubt that, as far as the Company in Westchester-county was concerned, the project was a creation of the Deputation from that County, and for no other purpose than that of assisting the "Committee to Detect Conspiracies," of which Committee two members of that Delegation were also members, in harrying the conservative farmers of the County, in the interest of "the cause of America" and that of the leaders of the Rebellion, in New York—for these reasons, the Resolutions may properly find a place in this narrative. They were in these words:

"WHEREAS, there are sundry disaffected and dangerous persons, in the Counties of Dutchess and Westchester, who do now greatly disturb the peace of the said Counties, and will most probably take up arms, whensoever the enemy shall make a descent upon this Colony, to the great annoyance of the said Counties, in particular, and of others the good people of this Colony:

"AND WHEREAS, by reason of the several drafts which have been made in the said Counties, according to the late recommendation of the Continental Congress, the Militia thereof are rendered incapable of keeping peace and order in the said Counties, without great inconvenience to themselves and much injury to and neglect of their private property; and, inasmuch as the interest of this Colony may be materially affected by any dissentions which may prevail in the said Counties, while the Continental troops are engaged in the defence of those Counties more immediately exposed to the inroads of the enemy: therefore

"RESOLVED, That one hundred men, Officers included, be raised in Dutchess-county, and that fifty men, Officers included, be raised in Westchester-county, and taken into the pay and service of this Congress, and confined to the service of those Counties, and to continue in pay until the first day of November next, unless sooner discharged by this or a future Congress of this Colony:

"That the one hundred men to be raised in Dutchess-county be divided into two Companies, each Company to consist of one Captain, one Lieutenant, three Sergeants, three Corporals, one Fifer, one Drummer, and forty Privates; and that the fifty men to be raised in Westchester-county consist of one Captain, one Lieutenant, three Sergeants, three Corporals, one Fifer, one Drummer, and forty Privates; that the pay of those three Companies be the same as the pay of the Continental troops; that the Captains be allowed eighteen shillings each, per week; the Lieutenants be allowed twelve shillings each, per week; and the Sergeants, Corporals, Fifers, Drummers, and Privates, eight shillings each, per week, in lieu of all rations and subsistence:

"That Melancton Smith be appointed Captain of one of the said Companies to be raised in Dutchess-county; and that John Durlin be appointed Captain of the other; and that Micah Townsend be appointed Captain of the said Company to be raised in Westchester-county:

"That the General Committees of the said Counties be authorized to nominate and appoint the Subaltern Officers to the said Companies, in their Counties, respectively:

"That the said three Companies be deemed one Corps; and that Melancton Smith be Captain Commandant; that Micah Townsend be the second Captain in rank; and that John Durlin be the third Captain in rank, in the said Corps:

"That the General Committees of the said Counties be authorized and requested to appoint a Muster-master in their respective Counties, to muster the said Companies; and that they transmit the names of such Muster-masters to the Committee appointed to audit the accounts of this Congress, without delay:

"That the said three Companies be subject to the order and direction of the General Committee of their respective Counties or such other person or persons as this or a future Congress of this Colony shall direct.

"ORDERED, That a certified copy of the aforesaid Resolutions be transmitted to the General Committees of Dutchess and Westchester-counties. And

"ORDERED, That Commissions be immediately issued to the Captains, and that blank Commissions be sent to the said Committees, to be by them issued to the Lieutenants."

It will be seen that no provisions were made by the Provincial Congress for either the recruiting, or the equipment, or the quarters, or the transportation of these men; and there will be some among the readers of this narrative who will say that if fifty unarmed, scattered men, on foot, could surely ensure the peace of so large and so widely extended a community as Colonial Westchester-county—and if those men

[1] *Journal of the Provincial Congress*, "Friday afternoon, June 21, 1776."
[2] Ibid.
[3] *Journal of the Provincial Congress*, "Saturday morning, June 22, 1776."

could not surely preserve that peace, their [illegible] were useless—the inhabitants of that County [illegible] have been as "dangerous" and its peace could not have been as "greatly disturbed" as the authors and promoters of these Resolutions had falsely pretended, among the recitals of their Preamble: others will suspect, not without reason, that the entire movement was a purely political job, gotten up for the purpose of affording political sop, at the expense of the Colony, for hungry adherents of the Bensons and the Morrise—suspicious which would be well-founded, since neither of the Dutchess-county Companies were subsequently known in history, except through the requisition on the Treasurer of the Colony, for their Pay and Subsistence;[1] while the Westchester-county Company, without having become known to history, in its capacity of an armed police, is known, in the military annals of the State,[2] for having done nothing else than changed its Lieutenant,[3] for asking for greater Pay,[4] and for drawing the Pay which was legitimately due to it.

Another instance of the spirit of partisan bitterness which prevailed, at that time, in Westchester-county, and of the unholy zeal with which the Town Committees urged forward the work of persecution and plunder, among their conservative neighbors, may be seen in the following note which was addressed by the Chairman of the Committee of the Town of Salem, in that County—that Committee which, a short time previously, had laid an embargo on Cattle intended for the supply of the inhabitants of the City of New York[6]—to the Provincial Congress:

"To the Honble. the Provincial Congress,
"New York:

"The Committee of Salem, in Westchester-county, "have the unhappiness of having a large number of "the inhabitants very much opposed to the measures "of the United Colonies, and numbers of them are "determined not to comply nor adopt the doings of "the Congress, which makes a great deal of trouble "for said Committee. Said Committee has adver-"tised some, obliged others to give bonds, some of "one or two hundred pounds, some of which have "forfeited their bonds and run off, and have made "considerable costs, one in particular, in sending "after him. We desire to know what shall be done "with the forfeitures, and likewise how to proceed in "taking of it, and how to turn it into money if taken "in stock or whatever else, or whether or no the Con-"gress wont take the forfeitures and pay the cost; "we desire you would give us some rules and direc-"tions how to proceed. And likewise, those men "that still behave inimical, and put the Committees "to so much trouble, whether or no we might not "take cost of them to pay us what is reasonable for

---

[1] *Journal of the Provincial Congress*, "Die Veneris, Novr. 1, 1776, 4 "o'clock, P.M."

[2] The only allusion to military duty discharged by this Company, which we have found, is that *Order* of the Provincial Congress, on the twenty-fifth of July, "that Captain Townsend of Westchester-county "return to duty, with his Company, at the mouth of Croton-river and "such places adjacent as the Officer or Officers commanding the Ameri "can troops or Militia, there, shall direct," (*Journal of the Provincial Congress*, "Thursday morning, July 25, 1776;") which was certainly beyond the line of duties for which it had been specifically raised.

[3] The County Committee, agreeably to the Resolutions of the Provincial Congress, presented in the text, appointed Samuel Townsend to the Lieutenantcy of this Company. Subsequently, Lieutenant Townsend was promoted to the command of another Company; and, on the sixteenth of August, Zephania Miller was appointed to the vacant Lieutenantcy. (*The General Committee of Westchester-county to the Convention of the State*, "August 16, 1776;" *Journal of the Provincial Convention*, "Die Veneris, "9 ho., A.M., August 16, 1776.")

[4] The following, copied from the original manuscript, (*Historical Manuscripts*, etc.: *Petitions*, xxxiii., 103, 104,) will be interesting to our readers, in this connection:

"To the Honorable the Convention of the State of New-York.

"The Petition of the Lieutenant non-commissioned officers & Privates "belonging to Captn Micah Townsend's company raised to be under the "Direction of the Committee of Westchester County, Humbly Sheweth,

"That the Honorable the Provincial Congress of this Colony when "they gave Instructions for raising Captn Townsend's Company allowed "the Lieutenant 12s. per week, and the non commissioned officers and "privates 8s. per week in lieu of Rations and Subsistance.

"That at and near the White Plains (which is the head Quarters of "the Company) the allowance for their subsistance does not amount to "near enough to support them, they being unable to get victuals for "less than 1s. per Meal, or to hire their Board at any tolerable rate but "by the week; that your Petitioners entered the Company & bid duty "in the most busy season of the year before & during Harvest time & "have had a harder share of duty than the Troops who were allowed by "your honorable House 20 Dollars Bounty & who have generally "received near 40 Dollars.

"Your Petitioners therefore humbly pray that your honorable House "will be pleased to increase the Pay for their Subsistance so far as to "enable them when they live with Frugality to support themselves by it "in the part of the County where they may reside, or be ordered. And "your Petitioners as in duty bound shall ever pray, &c.

"Zephaniah Miller, Lieutenant,	William Freebleborough,
"Jacob Travis, Serjent,	Jonathan Ferris,
"William Martin,* Serjent,	Robert Bloomer, Junr,
"Joshua Mead, Serjent,	Samuel Howell,
"Reuben Bloomer, Corpl,	Uriah Travis, Jun.,
"Thomas Brooks, Corpl,	Jonathan Finch,
"James Strobly, Corpl,	John Travis,
"Anthony Miller, Fifar,	James Miller, Junr,
"James Carpenter,	Zecheus Dible,
"William Williamson,	Abelim Hutchins,
"Elven Hyot,	Daniel Dean,
"William Suffon,	Jeremiah Rozelle,
"Moses Higgas,	John Mills,
"John Beaks,	Jeroliah Owen,
"William Seaman,	Benjamin Freebleborough,
"Elijah Miller, Junr,	Thomas Raymond,
"Nathan Holmes,	John Broadstreet,
"Samuel Lyon, Junr,	Samuel Miller,
"Stephen Mauday,	Robert Merritt.
"Frederick Datin,	

"In Committee of Safety for the County of Westchester,
"At the White Plains, Septr 2nd 1776.

"Resolved, that this Committee recommend to the honble the Con-"vention of this State the reasonableness of increasing the Subsistance "Money for Captn Townsend's Company as they are of opinion that 8s "per week per Man is not a sufficient provision for them.

"By order of the Committee,
"John Thomas, Junr, *Chairman.*"

[5] *Journal of the Committee of Safety*, "4 ho., P.M., Decr. 7, 1776."

[6] Vide pages 149, 150, note.

* The Deposition of John Martine, "of the Manor of Philipsburg near "the White Plains," (*Historical Manuscripts*, etc.; *Miscellaneous Papers*, xxxv., 273,) shows that this was William Martine, his son.

our time, for we grow weary of being called together to deal with tories. That has been our whole business ever since we have been formed as a Committee; it has cost me, in particular, not less than six hundred miles riding, and I believe, at a moderate guess, twenty or thirty dollars in cash, and I never yet expected pay; but I find I cant live so, and if the tories make all the trouble, why ought they not to pay all the cost. Gentlemen, we only want orders from you to take it. We have sent Mr. Ben. Chapman to you, praying of you to send us some directions on this important affair, one of the members of this Committee.

"By order of the Committee,

"EZEKIEL HAWLEY,[1] *Chairman.*

"June 5th, 1776."

That letter was laid before the Provincial Congress, on Saturday evening, the eighth of June; and the *Journal* of that body states that it was "read and "filed,"[2] the Congress itself, as will be seen in its subsequent proceedings in the matter, hesitating, in view of its atrocious propositions, to give the authority which its writer had so unblushingly solicited.

With the fact before him, that the "large number "of the inhabitants" of the Town of Salem which was referred to, in that letter, was composed of farmers, neighbors of the writer of it, and peacefully and industriously pursuing their usual vocations; and, with the additional fact before him, that none of these were even pretended to have committed any other offense, against either the King or the Congress, than the entertainment of political opinions which were different from those entertained by Ezekiel Hawley and his handful of "patriotic" confederates, thereader will be enabled to judge, with some degree of accuracy, concerning the really diabolical character of the letter and that of him who had written it.

The number of those who were thus proscribed and whose properties were so eagerly hankered for, was said to have been "large;" the proposed victims were "inhabitants" of Salem, and neighbors of Hawley and his confederates; they were quietly pursuing their usual rural occupations, doing no harm to any one, and violating no law, although their opinions, on partisan political questions, were not in accord with those which the latter professed to hold; both, at the same time, concurring, however, in the recognition of the King of Great Britain as their legitimate Sovereign; both professing to be equally and entirely good and loyal subjects of that reigning Monarch; both owing obedience to the Laws of the Land; and both, alike, recognizing the duty of that obedience,[3] although only one of the two discharged that duty, in its every day practice. Against those unoffending farmers—as their accusers have shown, they were nothing else—with a malignant zeal which betrayed its selfish, puritanic origin, the writer of that letter prayed that they should be arrested; that their properties, real and personal, should be seized, and escheated, and confiscated; that "costs" should be paid, therefrom, into the willing hands of those who should have thus invaded their individual Rights—Rights which had been guaranteed to each of them, by the Constitution and the Laws of the land—that their homes should be violated and destroyed; that their families should be made beggars, and be cast penniless on the world; and that, except among those who thus sought warrants to become local despots, nothing else than individual and domestic misery and general devastation and ruin should be aimed at and obtained. Can anything more atrocious be conceived? Can those who could calmly and deliberately devise such outrages, to be inflicted on a peaceful community, and that community their own immediate neighbors and townsmen, be regarded as anything else than monstrosities, in human form, in which only the baser and most brutal passions had found places? But, after all, these—the letter and the passions which had inspired it and the hand which had written it—were only the legitimate outcome of the barbarous propositions which John Jay and Gouverneur Morris and their partisan associates, taking advantage of a short period of peculiar anxiety and of labors of more than usual variety and importance, had led the jaded and almost exhausted Provincial Congress, it may

[1] Mr. Bolton said this Hawley was a grandson of Rev. Thomas Hawley, Pastor of the Congregational-church at Ridgefield, Connecticut; that he was one of the proprietors of the Oblong; that he held a Commission in the Continental Army; and that he was taken off by death, suddenly, in 1788. (*History of Westchester-county*, original edition, i., 174; *the same*, second edition, i., 738.)

The "Continental" Commission referred to, by Mr. Bolton, was nothing else than that of First Lieutenant in Captain Truesdale's Company of Colonial Militia, "for the North End of Salem"—a local Company of notoriously very little account, (*Returns of Election of Officers*, December 18, 1775, in the *Historical Manuscripts*, etc.: *Military Returns*, xxxii., 245.)

[2] *Journal of the Provincial Congress*, "Die Saldati, 6 ho., P M., June 8, "1776."

[3] "To do justice even to rebels, let it here be mentioned that * * * Nay, "so far were they from interfering with the law, that the Magistrates "continued in full possession of the Civil powers and the Courts of Jus-"tice were open in the usual manner until the Declaration of Indepen-"dence. In April Term, 1776, several rebel soldiers were indicted for "some Petty Larcenies, tried, convicted, and punished by order of the "Court without any interference of the Military; their Officers at-"tended the trials, heard the evidence, and upon their conviction de-"clared that ample justice was done them, and thanked the Judge for "his candor and impartiality, during the course of the trials."—Jones's *History of New York during the Revolutionary War*, i., 137.

Judge Jones, the writer of the above paragraph, was, at that time, one of the Judges of the Supreme Court of the Colony, and personally acquainted with the facts stated. His practice was, in matters in which he was personally concerned, to mention no name; and the conduct certainly seems to indicate that the Trial was in the City of New York; but the learned Editor of that remarkable work, has stated, in the *Index*, (ii., 691,) undoubtedly on competent authority, that the Court referred to was held at the White Plains, in Westchester-county; and that the presiding Judge of that Court was Thomas Jones, the writer of the work from which this paragraph was taken.

have been unwittingly, to establish as the formal enactments of that revolutionary body.[1]

As we have said, the letter which Ezekiel Hawley, in behalf of the Committee of the Town of Salem, wrote to the Provincial Congress, was laid before that body, on Saturday evening, the eighth of June; when it was read and filed.[2] On the following morning, [*Sunday, June* 9, 1775,] the Congress directed the following answer to be made to that remarkable letter:

"IN PROVINCIAL CONGRESS,
"NEW-YORK, June 9, 1775.

"SIR:

"Your letter by Mr. Chapman, of the 5th inst., was "laid before the Congress, who are of opinion that "the contents require the most serious consideration, "and have directed me to acquaint you that whenever "several matters of importance for the general defense "and preservation of the Colony, now under consider-"ation, are despatched, the Committee of Salem may "be assured a proper attention will be made on their "application, the Congress not doubting that Commit-"tee will still persevere, with zeal in the cause of "their country.

"By order,
"NATHANIEL WOODHULL, *President.*

"To EZEKIEL HAWLEY, ESQR., *Chairman*
"*of the Committee of Salem, Westchester.*"[3]

Had Gouverneur Morris or John Jay been present, when the Provincial Congress received or when it answered that letter, the answer would probably have been of a different tenor; but John Morin Scott, who was present on both occasions, and whose [illegible] mind probably controlled, wisely halted, and evidently induced the Congress to halt, in the work of proposed persecution and devastation and ruin. The Committee of Salem was coldly dismissed, without even a word of sympathy; and the Provincial Congress paid no further attention to the subject.

With a persistency which was worthy of a better purpose, notwithstanding the rebuke which the Provincial Congress had thus administered, the Committee at Salem was not disposed to be thus relegated to the obscurity of a rural Town; and, subsequently, two other letters, relating to the same general subject of "the disaffected persons who were under bonds to "that Committee," were addressed by it, to the Congress. The first of these letters is in these words:

"GENTLEMEN:

"As our civil and religious privileges all lie at "stake, we that are friends thereto desire to lend a "lifting hand in trying to preserve them; and as the "tories grow more and more disaffected, and are daily "going off on to Long island—four men last week "from my neighborhood, several more from other "parts, Capt. Theal and his son John Lobdin, and "Stephen Delance" [*De Lancey?*] "some of them "laid under £500. bonds and also the solemnity of an "oath—but they regard not any thing the Commit-"tee does with them, so long as they have their lib-"erty. It is supposed numbers are concealed on "Long island. Please to take it into your wise con-"sideration, whether or no it will not be best to send "and purge Long island; and as I wrote to you a "little back by Mr. Chapman, one of the members of "Salem Committee, to know what we should do with "those that forfeit their bonds, and how we should "get pay for the last, as there is since many more, we "should be glad of an answer.

"By order of the Committee,
"EZEKIEL HAWLEY, *Chairman.*

"SALEM, June 22d, 1776.

"To THE HONOURABLE THE PROVINCIAL CONGRESS
"OF NEW-YORK."[4]

Two days after that letter was written, [*June* 24, 1776,] the Sub-committees of Cortlandt and Salem united in the following letter, also addressed to the Provincial Congress; and in order to expedite the consideration of the subject to which it was devoted, by that body, Ezekiel Hawley was formally directed to forward it, "with all convenient speed."

"SALEM, 24th of June, 1776.

"GENTLEMEN:

"Whereas sundry persons of note have lately ab-"sconded from our part of the country, and we have "reason to think, from several circumstances, are "(with numbers of others) assembling together on

[1] The question of the extent to which the several Provincial Congresses, uninfluenced by the outside pressure of homemade partisan demonstrations or by the inside domination of those who assumed to social or intellectual superiority, would have given their authority for the enactment and execution of such violent measures, against those of their fellow Colonists who did not concur in all which was done by the Continental Congress of 1774, as we have noticed, is worthy of the examination which it will some day receive at the hands of an intelligent, industrious, and fearless student.

If we do not mistake, and we incline to the belief that we do not, when that examination shall have been made, very much of the responsibility for the multitude of atrocious acts which were done in behalf of "the cause of America" and of "the Liberties of America," will be shifted from the shoulders of sensible, but modest and less energetic, men, where it now rests, to those of men who are now represented as having been incapable of such enormities.

History tells of more than one instance in which a mere handful of enthusiasts, more or less honest in their professions, has fastened itself on a great political party which entertained none of those enthusiastic dogmas which the others assumed to believe and maintain, and which, having thus fastened itself on the larger body, taking advantage of favorable opportunities, artfully adapting itself to existing tempers and circumstances, and persistently—sometimes, impudently—thrusting itself into every seat of influence and authority to which it could possibly gain access, has succeeded in remoulding the policy of the party which it has invaded; and made it appear to be what, originally, it was not; to maintain opinions which, originally, it disclaimed and opposed; and to do, or permit to be done, in its name, what, originally, it would have honestly shrunk from, as improper and unjust. Such an instance, if we do not mistake, occurred in this Colony, in 1775 and 1776: we were personally acquainted with a similar instance, vastly more important in its consequences than the other, which occurred within the United States, at a comparatively recent date.

[2] Vide page 175, ante.

[3] *Journal of the Provincial Congress*, "Sunday morning, June 9, 1776."

[4] *Journal of the Provincial Congress: Correspondence*, ii., 196, 197.

"Long island, with a view to join the Ministerial "Army, we beg the Congress would take the matter "under consideration, and adopt such measures as to "you shall appear most proper for the removal of such "dangerous assemblages, who we fear are forming "a combination to aid and assist the Ministerial Army "when an opportunity shall permit.

"ORDERED, That the same be forwarded with all "convenient speed by Mr. Ezekiel Halley.

"By the joint order of the Sub-committees of the "manor of Cortlandt and Salem.

"EZEKIEL HALLEY,
"JOSEPH BENEDICT,
"*Chairmen.*

"TO THE HONOURABLE THE PROVINCIAL CONGRESS."[1]

These two letters were presented to the Provincial Congress, on the afternoon of the twenty-fourth of June; read before that body; and ordered "to remain "for further consideration;"[2] and there, as far as we have knowledge, they have remained, from that day until this—the Provincial Congress certainly paid no further attention to them.

Closely connected with it, if it was not really the basis of that policy of proscription and persecution and devastation which peculiarly distinguished the entire series of Provincial Congresses and Committees of Safety of the Colony of New York, as well as the early Conventions and Legislatures of the State, after the Colony had ceased to exist, was the series of Tests, known as *Associations*, which were enacted, first, by the Continental Congress of 1774 and, subsequently, in various forms, by the Provincial Congresses of New York, by the latter of whom and by their several Committees of Safety they were, also, rigidly enforced, as we have seen, in other portions of this narrative.

One of these Tests, or *Associations*, adopted by a Provincial Committee of Safety, was proved to have been so entirely subversive of the personal Rights of those to whom it was offered, that numbers who had previously favored or acquiesced in the Rebellion, peremptorily declined to sign it, preferring rather to be considered as disaffected and to be disarmed, as such,[3] and to suffer all the other pains and penalties and insults to which those who were known as "dis-"affected" were continually subjected.

The disaffection referred to must have been quite extended, seriously impairing the prospects of a political uniformity throughout the Colony, to which the leaders of the Rebellion had constantly aspired, or the Provincial Congress would not have turned aside from its daily routine to have noticed it. As it had reached those proportions which entitled it to respect, however, on the eighteenth of June, three days after the organization of "the Committee to detect Conspir-"acies," the Provincial Congress adopted the following Resolution, on the subject:

"WHEREAS doubts have arisen respecting the true "construction of a certain *Association* ordered by the "late Committee of Safety of this Colony, to be pre-"sented for subscription to the inhabitants thereof:

"RESOLVED, That all doubts respecting the true "construction of the said *Association* ought to be re-"moved; and that a Committee be appointed to "prepare and report a Resolution for that purpose."[4]

On the twentieth of June, the Committee which had been appointed to consider the subject—a Committee composed of Thomas Tredwell and John Sloss Hobart, of Suffolk, and John Jay, of the City of New York, all of whom were distinguished for their rigid and intense partisan feelings—submitted its Report, evidently the work of John Jay, by whom it was presented. As it was intended to be submitted to the inhabitants of Westchester-county, and to be employed as the basis of fresh outrages against their persons and properties, it may properly find a place in this narrative:

"IN PROVINCIAL CONGRESS,
"NEW-YORK, June 20, 1776.

"WHEREAS, the Continental Congress, on the "fourteenth day of March last, did recommend to the "several Assemblies, Conventions, and Councils or "Committees of Safety of the United Colonies, im-"mediately to cause all persons to be disarmed within "their respective Colonies, who were notoriously dis-"affected to the cause of America, or had not associ-"ated, and refused to associate to defend, by arms, "these United Colonies, against the hostile attempts "of the British Fleets and Armies:

"AND, WHEREAS, the late Committee of Safety of "this Colony did, thereupon, on the twenty-seventh "day of March aforesaid, recommend it to the Com-"mittees of the several Cities, Counties, Manors, "Townships, Precincts, and Districts in this Colony, "forthwith, to cause to be disarmed, all persons "within their respective districts, who were known "to be disaffected to the cause of America, and also "all such persons as should refuse to sign the follow-"ing *Association*, viz.:

"'We, the subscribers, inhabitants of . . . . ,
"'in the County of . . . . . , and Colony
"'of New York, do voluntarily and solemnly engage,
"'under all the ties held sacred among mankind, at
"'the risk of our lives and fortunes, to defend, by
"'arms, the United American Colonies, against the
"'hostile attempts of the British Fleets and Armies,
"'until the present unhappy controversy between
"'the two Countries shall be settled.'

[1] *Journal of the Provincial Congress: Correspondence*, ii., 197.

[2] *Journal of the Provincial Congress*, "Monday afternoon, June 24, "1776."

[3] *Recital* in the Preamble of the new *Association*, adopted by the Provincial Congress, on the twentieth of June, 1776.

[4] *Journal of the Provincial Congress*, "Tuesday morning, June 18, 1776."

"And whereas it hath been objected to the said "form of an *Association*, that, by obliging the sub-"scribers or associators, in such general and express "terms, to defend the United Colonies, by arms, "against the hostile attempts of the British Fleets "and Armies, it deprived them of the Rights reserved "by the *Militia Regulations*, and imposed on them the "necessity of marching to the most distant of the "Colonies, whenever called upon, which construction "of the said *Association*, however nice and casuistical, "is inconsistent and fallacious, it being manifest that "the *Militia Regulations* could, by no rules of construc-"tion, be supposed to be repealed and abrogated by "any subtle implications drawn from the said *Associ-"tion*. But, as some of the friends to the American "cause have been influenced, by this objection, to "refuse signing the said *Association*, and, in conse-"quence thereof, been disarmed, it hath become ex-"pedient that the said *Association* should be so ex-"plained as to render it free from specious as well as "solid objections; and, therefore,

"Resolved, unanimously, That nothing in the "said *Association* contained, shall extend or be con-"strued to extend to deprive those who have sub-"scribed it of any Rights reserved to them, in and by "the said *Militia Regulations;* and to the end that all "the Freemen of this Colony may associate for the "preservation of American liberty, in a form entirely "unexceptionable;

"Resolved, unanimously, That the following "form of an *Association* be and it is hereby recom-"mended to them, viz.:

"'We, the subscribers, inhabitants of . . . . ,
"'in the County of . . . . , and Colony of New
"'York, do most solemnly declare that the claims of
"'the British Parliament to bind, at their discretion,
"'the people of the United Colonies in America, in
"'all cases whatsoever, are, in our opinions, absurd,
"'unjust, and tyrannical; and that the hostile at-
"'tempts of their Fleets and Armies to enforce sub-
"'mission to those wicked and ridiculous claims
"'ought to be resisted by arms.

"'And, therefore, we do engage and associate,
"'under all the ties which we respectively hold
"'sacred, to defend, by arms, these United Colonies,
"'against the said hostile attempts, agreeable to such
"'Laws and Regulations as our Representatives in
"'the Congresses or future General Assemblies of
"'this Colony have or shall, for that purpose, make
"'and establish.'

"And that all persons who have been disarmed for "refusing to associate with their countrymen, for the "defense of the United Colonies, in the form pre-"scribed by the late Committee of Safety, as afore-"said, may have no pretence to complain of injus-"tice, and that they may have a fair opportunity of "convincing the public that their refusal to sign the "said *Association* did not arise from a disinclination "to defend the Rights of America, but merely from "objections to sign to the form of the said *Association*, "and thereby be restored to the privilege of bearing "arms in support of a cause so important and so "glorious;

"Resolved, unanimously, That all persons, "other than those whom the Committees of the sev-"eral Counties shall adjudge to be notoriously disaf-"fected to the American cause, who have not asso-"ciated in the form prescribed by the late Committee "of Safety, as aforesaid, be called upon, by persons "to be appointed by the said Committees of the sev-"eral Counties, and requested to subscribe the *Asso-"ciation* contained and recommended in and by these "Resolutions. And

"Resolved, further, That all such of the said "persons as shall subscribe the same, other than "notoriously disaffected persons, as aforesaid, ought "to be considered and treated as friends to their "country; and that all arms taken from them and "not disposed of to the Continental troops, be re-"stored to them; and that care be taken that they "respectively be paid the full price allowed, for such "of their arms as may have been delivered to the "Continental troops, as aforesaid.

"And further, that all such of the said persons "as shall refuse to subscribe to the same, together "with all notorious disaffected persons, be forthwith, "if not already done, disarmed, and required on oath "to declare and discover whether the arms so to be "taken from them be all the arms they respectively "have or had, and if not, where the residue thereof, "to the best of their knowledge and belief, are depos-"ited and may be found; and that such of them as "shall refuse to take such oath, be committed to safe "custody till they will consent to take it.

"Resolved, unanimously, That it be and it is "hereby recommended to the Committees of the sev-"eral Counties in this Colony, to carry the aforesaid "Resolutions into execution, with diligence and "punctuality."[1]

It is said that the Report and Resolutions were unanimously adopted by the Provincial Congress, evidently without the slightest consideration of their characters and probable result, and certainly during the latter portion of an afternoon session of the Congress, in which, both before and after the presentation of them, that body was crowded with other and very important matters of business; and it is said to have ordered, at that time, that the Resolutions should be printed in all the newspapers which were then published in the City of New York and in hand-bills; and "that the Resolutions be read to every "person to whom the *Association* thereby recom-"mended shall be offered for subscription."[2]

Whatever the real motives of those who had de-

[1] *Journal of the Provincial Congress*, "Thursday Afternoon, June 20, "1776."

[2] Ibid.

ined to sign the *Association* which the Committee of Safety had prescribed, had been, they were such as had led the Provincial Congress to notice them, respectfully, and to lead that body to move for the removal of the objections which had been thus reasonably raised against that *Association*, by those whom the Provincial Congress's Committee was constrained to recognize as "friends to the American cause;" and it ill became John Jay, therefore, to display so many of the idiosyncrasies of his generally unamiable character, in the contemptuous and singularly insulting words which he applied to those of his fellow "friends of the American cause" who had presumed to take their knowledge of the legal obligations contained in that objectionable *Association* from some one else than from himself and his Congressional confrerie; and an impartial examination of the two forms of *Association*, and a careful comparison of that revised form, which he induced the Provincial Congress to substitute for that against which the objections had been raised, with the latter, will clearly indicate to the reader that the writer of that revised form had permitted his evil passions to get the better of his personal integrity, when he belittled himself by reporting an *Association* which was even more objectionable in its provisions than that which had been objected to, dressed and decorated with a meaningless Preamble, evidently intended for the beguilement of the unwary, but without containing a single word of provision, either in the Preamble or in the *Association* itself, that the signers of that revised instrument, by that act, would not deprive themselves of their Rights as Militia, and subject themselves to be taken beyond the limits of the Colony, even to the extent of the most distant of the confederated Colonies, whenever some body, over whom they could exercise no control, should incline to order them thither. Indeed, instead of relieving the *Association* which the Committee of Safety had recommended, from the uncertainties of its provisions, the only duty which had been assigned to John Jay and his two rustic associates, these astute partisans, in the bitterness of their animosities, did nothing else, in the way of the duty which had devolved on them, than to indulge in contemptuous sneers and inuendoes against those who had objected to the terms of the Committee of Safety's *Association*, without including, in their revised form, the provisions of safety which the Provincial Congress had evidently intended to have inserted; and, by the addition of words which were not in the former, they actually made the signers of the revised *Association*, more than before, the helpless subjects of two absolutely despotic bodies, over neither of whom could they bring any, even the slightest, restraining influence, no matter how objectionable and oppressive the Orders and enactments of either or both of those bodies might be.

As a man thinketh in his heart, so he is; and it will be difficult, in the light of such actions as this, to convince any honest man that, whatever he may have been after he had reached that place in the office-bearing ranks of his countrymen which he so greatly coveted and of which he was so exceeding fond, while John Jay was still struggling for place, it mattered little under what master, he was neither more nor less upright, in what he said and did for the advancement of his individual or his party's purposes, than are office-seekers of our own day, with whom the end in view is generally made to justify the means.

On the twenty-sixth of June, the Provincial Congress received a letter from the President of the Continental Congress, dated on the preceding day, and enclosing a Resolution of that body,[1] the latter of which, because of its remarkable character, is entitled to a passing notice, in this place. The Resolution referred to was in these words:

"IN CONGRESS, June 24, 1776.

"RESOLVED, That all persons abiding within any "of the United Colonies and deriving protection from "the Laws of the same, owe allegiance to the said "Laws and are members of such Colony; and that all "persons passing through, visiting, or making a tem-"porary stay in any of the said Colonies, being en-"titled to the protection of the Laws during the time "of such passage, visitation, or temporary stay, owe, "during the same time, allegiance thereto.

"That all persons, members of or owing allegiance "to any of the United Colonies, as before described, "who shall levy war against any of the said Colonies, "within the same, or be adherent to the King of Great "Britain or others, the enemies of the said Colonies, or "any of them, within the same, giving to him or them "aid or comfort, are guilty of treason against such "Colony.

"That it be recommended to the Legislatures of "the several United Colonies to pass Laws for punish-"ing, in such manner as to them shall seem fit, such "persons, as before described, as shall be proveably "attainted of open deed, by people of their condi-"tions, of any of the treasons before described.

"That it be recommended to the Legislatures of "the several United Colonies, to pass Laws for pun-"ishing, in such manner as they shall think fit, per-"sons who shall counterfeit, or aid or abet in coun-"terfeiting, the Continental Bills of Credit, or who "shall pass any such Bill, in payment, knowing the "same to be counterfeit.

"By order of Congress,

"JOHN HANCOCK, *President*."[2]

The *Journal of the Continental Congress* tells us that this remarkable paper formed a part of the Report of the Committee on Spies, to that body; and that Com-

[1] *Journal of the Provincial Congress*, "Wednesday morning, June 26, "1776."

[2] *Journal of the Provincial Congress: Correspondence*, ii., 196.

See, also, *Journal of the Continental Congress*, "Monday, June 24, "1776."

mittee appears to have been composed of John Adams, Thomas Jefferson, Edward Rutledge, James Wilson, and Robert R. Livingston;[1] but the character of those who framed the Resolution only increases our surprise, and, more clearly than before, indicates the desperate straits into which, even at that early date, the Continental Congress had been crowded, unless the "spies" against whom the Committee fulminated its Report were those Commissioners whom the Ministry had authorized to treat for Reconcilation and Peace,[2] and who were, at that time, nearing and not distant from New York; and unless, also, the Continental Congress, by these Resolutions, proposed to naturalize Admiral Howe, and General Howe, and the forces which were respectively under their command; and to transform all these, on their arrival within the harbor of New York, into "members of "the Colony" of New York, "owing allegiance to "the Laws of the United Colonies," and subject to be tried on a charge of "Treason against such Colony" of New York, should they become prisoners of war.

Whatever the purposes of the Continental Congress may have been, in the adoption and promulgation of these Resolutions, no one can attribute to the learned lawyers who reported them the slightest sincerity, since none knew better than they, that "allegiance," under any possible circumstances, was not and could not become due to what was nothing else than a mere "Law," and that the "Law" of a mere "Colony," which might be enacted on one day and be repealed on the next; that "allegiance" was, then, and would always be, due to nothing else than to the Sovereign of whom the person was or should become, legitimately, a subject; that an avowed sojourner, "passing through" a Colony or merely "visiting" it or "making a temporary stay" within it, at the same time owing "allegiance" to the Sovereign of another country, while he would certainly owe obedience to the local Law, during the entire period of his journey through or of his visit to or of his temporary stay within that Colony, by no Law nor by any possible interpretation of a Law which would have been entitled to the slightest respect, only by reason of that journey or visit or temporary stay, could have been said to have surrendered his "allegiance" due only to his own Sovereign, and, instead, only for the same reason, to have become a subject of, owing "allegiance" to, the authority which controlled the place of his journey or visit or temporary stay, and especially so while that place was or should continue to be only an acknowledged dependency of a foreign Prince, to whom it was or should be, itself, avowedly subject, and by whom no such enactment or order had been made; that no mere Colony, dependent on another and superior political power, could, as it has been said, sincerely, by such a Committee, to have possessed a political Sovereignty, nor that, in the absence of such a Sovereignty, there could possibly have been a respectable and competent charge of Treason against it, in any instance whatever; and, more than all, that such a pretense and threat of charges of Treason against a Colony, made by the Committee, in its Resolutions, was simply a harmless thunderbolt, before the Law, since the King of Great Britain, against whom and against whose authority the Resolutions were specifically directed, was, at the time of the adoption and promulgation of these Resolutions, actually the Sovereign of all those Colonies and of all those who were thus denouncing him, openly and generally recognized, throughout the former, as the source of all their legitimate political authority and as their King; and, by the members of that Committee and the authors of those Resolutions, themselves, specifically recognized as the Sovereign to whom each and every of them was himself proud to owe allegiance.[3]

"Allegiance" and "Treason" presupposed Sovereignty existing in the Colonies, without which Sovereignty there could not have possibly been any "Allegiance" due to either of them nor "Treason" committed against them or either of them; but it would require a bold man, possessed of a very vivid imagination, to maintain, seriously and honestly, that any such Sovereignty existed in the Colonies, or in any or either of them, on the twenty-fourth of June, 1776, when the Continental Congress adopted these Resolutions, whatever there might have been or not have been, in the several States, a fortnight afterwards.

What the result of this action of the Continental Congress was, will be seen, hereafter.

Another very important subject which was introduced to the notice of the third Provincial Congress, during its very brief existence, was that of supplanting the existing Colonial Government by the establishment of a new form of Government which would more nearly represent the current spirit of those who were leaders in the Rebellion, and which, more than anything else, would indicate a determination to sever the political connection of the Colony with the Mother Country.

On the tenth of May, 1776, the Continental Congress, after a very severe and very protracted consideration of the subject, had adopted a Resolution;[4] and on the fifteenth of the same month, it had pre-

[1] *Journal of the Continental Congress*, "Wednesday, June 5, 1776."

[2] "According to the noble Lord's explanation, Lord Howe and his "brother are to be sent as Spies, not as Commissioners; that if they can-"not go on shore, they are to sound upon the coast."—(*Speech of Charles James Fox, on the Motion for Lord Howe's Instructions*, "House of Com-"mons, Wednesday, May 22, 1776.")

[3] See, in the *Address to the King*, by the same Continental Congress and signed by each of its members, individually, (*Journal of the Continental Congress*, "Saturday, July 8, 1775,") what, at the date of these Resolutions, contained, unaltered, all which had been said, formally, of the disposition, *toward the King*, of either the Congress or of its individual members.

[4] *Journal of the Continental Congress*, "Friday, May 10, 1776."

fixed to that Resolution, a Preamble,[1] which, together, were in these words:

"WHEREAS his Britannic Majesty, in conjunction "with the Lords and Commons of Great Britain, has, "by a late Act of Parliament, excluded the inhabi-"tants of these United Colonies from the protection "of his Crown;

"AND WHEREAS no answer whatever to the humble "*Petition of the Colonies*, for redress of grievances and "reconciliation with Great Britain, has been or is "likely to be given, but the whole force of that King-"dom, aided by foreign mercenaries, is to be exerted "for the destruction of the good people of these Col-"onies;

"AND WHEREAS it appears absolutely irreconcilable "to reason and good conscience for the people of these "Colonies, now, to take the Oaths and Affirmations "necessary for the support of any Government under "the Crown of Great Britain, and it is necessary that "the exercise of every kind of authority under the "said Crown should be totally suppressed, and all the "powers of Government exerted under the authority "of the people of the Colonies, for the preservation of "internal peace, virtue, and good order, as well as for "the defence of their lives, liberties, and properties, "against the hostile invasions and cruel depredations "of their enemies, therefore

"RESOLVED, That it be recommended to the re-"spective Assemblies and Conventions of the United "Colonies, where no Government sufficient to the "exigencies of their affairs hath been hitherto estab-"lished, to adopt such Government as shall, in the "opinion of the representatives of the people, best "conduce to the happiness and safety of their constit-"uents, in particular, and America, in general.'

The careful reader of that Preamble and Resolution will not fail to see, in every portion of them, only Independence very thinly disguised;[2] and he will not be surprised to learn that those, within the Continental Congress, who were most desirous of effecting a Reconciliation with the Mother Country, were most resolute in opposing the adoption of them;[3] nor that, after they had been adopted, those of the Delegation from the Colony of New York who had been among those who had opposed that favorable action, very soon retired from their seats in the Continental Congress and occupied seats in the Provincial Congress of New York,[4] where, by means of a similar line of action, adverse to the adoption of a new form of local Government and to the evidently approaching question of Independence, both those radical measures might be successfully opposed, at least until the Royal Commissioners whom the Home Government had sent to effect a Reconciliation, should have arrived and presented their proposals, and until those who were anxious to figure, in New York and at London, as diplomatists and as peace-makers, rather than as friends or promoters of Independence, should have had an opportunity to dispense with Independence; to restore the old order of the Colonial Government, with here and there a revision which would be favorable to themselves or to their faction; and to establish for themselves, at least, such a substantial claim on the gratitude of the Crown and of the Nation, as would ensure to them the control of the restored Colonial Governments, at home, if not something more acceptable, abroad.[5]

---

[1] *Journal of the Continental Congress*, "Wednesday, May 15, 1776."

[2] "Great Britain has at last driven America to the last step: a com-"plete separation from her, a total, absolute Independence, not only "of her Parliament, but of her Crown, for such is the amount of the "Resolve of the 15th. Confederation among ourselves or Alliances "with foreign nations are not necessary to a perfect separation from "Britain; that is effected by extinguishing all authority under the "Crown, Parliament, and Nation, as the Resolution for instituting "Governments has done, to all intents and purposes. Confederation "will be necessary for our internal concord, and Alliances may be "so for our external defense."—(*John Adams to Mrs. Adams*, "PHILA-"DELPHIA, May 17, 1776.")

As the writer of this paragraph was the Chairman of the Committee who framed the Preamble, and as he probably wrote it, there need be no better authority concerning the intent of him who framed it, as well as concerning his understanding of the meaning and of the consequences of it.

See, also, *Stephen Hopkins to Governor Cooke, of Rhode Island*, "PHILA-"DELPHIA, May 15, 1776."

[3] The Delegation from Pennsylvania, subsequently such determined opponents of Independence, were resolute opposers of this Preamble and Resolution, and declined to vote on it, "as far as was in their "power, withdrawing the Province from this union of the Colonies, "both in council and action."—(*The Philadelphia Committee to the Committees of the rural Counties of Pennsylvania*, "PHILADELPHIA, May 21, "1776.") The majority of the Delegates from New York subsequently repeated their opposition to the measure, in the Provincial Congress of that Colony, where, also, their opposition to the Resolution of Independence was so peculiarly conspicuous. Although we have found no record of the action of the Delegations from New Jersey and Maryland, on that particular question, the subsequent action of the local revolutionary bodies, in those Colonies, concerning those Delegations, leaves no room for doubt concerning what the action of their respective Delegations had been.

[4] John Alsop and Francis Lewis took seats in the Provincial Congress, on the twentieth of May; John Jay appeared on the twenty-fifth of that month; James Duane, who had some other place in the Continental service, showed himself on the second of June; and Philip Livingston lingered until the eighth of June—all of them were there in season to accomplish, as far as the Provincial Congress of New York could be employed in such a work, all they had set out to do, in the work of procrastination, of reconciliation with the Mother Country, and of continued Colonial dependence.

[5] "Things have come to such a pass, now, as to convince us that we "have nothing more to expect from the justice of Great Britain; also, "that she is capable of the most delusive arts; for I am satisfied that "no Commissioners ever were designed, except Hessians and other "foreigners; and that the idea was only to deceive and throw us off "our guard. The first has been too effectually accomplished, as many "members of Congress, in short, the representation of whole Provinces, "are still feeding themselves upon the dainty food of reconciliation; "and, though they will not allow it at the expectation of it has any "influence upon their judgment with respect to their preparations for "defence, it is but too obvious that it has an operation upon every part "of their conduct, and is a clog to their proceedings. It is not in "the nature of things to be otherwise; for no man that entertains "a hope of seeing this dispute speedily and equitably adjusted by "Commissioners will go to the same expense and run the same hazards "to prepare for the worst event, as he who believes that he must "conquer, or submit to unconditional terms and the like concomitants, "such as confiscation, hanging, and the like." (*General Washington to his brother, Augustine Washington*, "PHILADELPHIA, 31 May, 1776.")

Although an official copy of that Preamble and Resolution was evidently sent to the Provincial Congress of New York, no mention was made of the receipt of it, on the *Journals* of that body; but, on the twenty-fourth of May, "the order of the day being "read, the Congress proceeded to take into considera-"tion" the Resolution and the general subject to which it particularly related.[1]

* * * * * *

The Provincial Congress having "considered" the Report, it also adopted it, evidently without debate or a division of the house,—Westchester-county was unrepresented in that exceedingly important vote, owing to the absence of a quorum of its Deputation; —and, after the Congress had ordered the Resolutions to be published in all the newspapers in the Colony and in handbills, the latter for distribution in the rural Counties,[2] it appears to have dismissed the entire subject from its further attention.

The Resolutions which were thus adopted and published, form the foundation of the entire structure of the *Constitution of the State of New York*, in all its varied forms; and, for that reason, we have not hesitated to find places, in this narrative, for all which concerned them. We are not insensible of the fact, however, that the fair words which they contain were deceptive; that the voice and the votes to which the election of the proposed founders of a State was thus referred, were not those of "the Inhabitants" who had figured so largely in the preliminary Report, but only those of the Freeholders and those of the tenantry who were of the wealthier class, to the exclusion of the tenantry of small properties and of the Mechanics and Working-men of the Colony, and certainly to the exclusion of those who had been officially proscribed and officially outraged, and for whom, under subsequent action of the Congress, yet more atrocious proscription and persecution and outrage were held in reserve. We are not insensible, also, that, notwithstanding the seeming eagerness of its authors, at that time, to remove the "many and great "inconveniences," as well as that power of despotic oppression and tyranny which "attended the mode of "Government by Congress and Committees," of some of which "inconveniences" and despotism the reader has been already made acquainted, they were not subsequently so eager—they certainly loitered over their work until after the Royal Commissioners had exhausted their ingenuity as well as their authority in fruitless efforts to effect a Reconciliation and to restore harmony between the Colonies and the Mother Country; and, even at that later day, John Morin Scott and Alexander McDougal and others of the same class having, meantime, obtained other places which filled their expectations, the puny thing which was created and entitled *The Constitution of the State of New York*, was introduced to the world, and fostered by political midwives and wetnurses who cared nothing for it beyond what they could severally make from it. Most of all, we are not insensible of the fact that, notwithstanding all the fine words, concerning the "People" and the "Inhabitants" and their unquestionable political authority, which were included in the Resolutions, the oligarchic authors of those Resolutions carefully reserved to themselves, the sole authority to determine whether a Constitution should or should not be created; and to determine, also, if they should consider a Constitution were necessary and proper, in what words and with what provisions that Constitution should be composed; without the slightest recognition of any existing Right or authority, in the constituent "People" or "Inhabitants," to consider all such action of those who pretended to be the "representatives" of that "People" or of those "Inhabitants," and to ratify and approve or to disallow and reject the same, or any portion thereof, at its or their pleasure, as might be done by the recognized sovereign power; and as, in this instance, it certainly should have been done.[3] It will be seen, hereafter, in what manner the "oligarchy" who was seated in the Provincial Congress, controlling the affairs of the Colony in their own interest, and who intended to be re-elected, betrayed both the "Inhabitants" and the "People," in imposing upon both, a new form of Government, without their consent, but not until their own purposes to secure their own ends through the older Colonial form, had become unsuccessful.

The subject of a new form of Government was scarcely disposed of, when, on the fourth of June, the same "Society of Mechanics in Union," so called, whom the master-spirits of the Committee of Fifty-one had deceived and betrayed—the same who was composed of the fragments of that phantom which had been known by the general title of "The Sons of

[1] *Journal of the Provincial Congress*, "Die Veneris, 9 ho., A.M., May "24, 1776."

[2] *Journal of the Provincial Congress* "Die Veneris, 4 ho., P. M., May "31, 1776."

[3] This peculiarity of the Resolutions of the Provincial Congress did not escape the vigilant attention of the Working men and tenants of only small properties, within the City of New-York—of those very "poor "reptiles" of whom Gouverneur Morris had written to Mr. Penn, in May, 1774, (*vide page* 12, *ante*)—and only with whose very acceptable help, the Delegation to the Continental Congress of 1774 had managed to secure their seats in that body. Whatever may have been their standing in the social scale of aristocracy, but for the co-operation of those who constituted the so called, "Society of Mechanics in Union," there would have been no place for either James Duane or John Jay in the Continental Congress of 1774 or in that similar Congress which succeeded it; and without their assent and approval, corruptly secured, in every instance except one, the members of the Delegation to the first named of those Congresses, if not those to both, had lived in fretful obscurity, and have died as their respective ancestors had died, "unwept, unhonored, and "unsung." There was a fitness, therefore, in the alarm of these Working-men of the City of New York, because of the contemptuous disregard of their political Rights, by those, of the Provincial Congress, who were only the creatures of their plebeian will and the administrators of their inherent authority. The Address of the Society, which those working-men subsequently presented to the Provincial Congress, on that subject, a master-piece of political reasoning, has been preserved in the archives of the State, and will be referred to hereafter.

"Liberty," and from whom has proceeded that excellent body, still existing, which is distinguished by the title of "The General Society of Mechanics and "Tradesmen of the City of New York"—presented an Address to the Provincial Congress, on the subject of Independence.

The signers of that *Address*, the first movement concerning Independence in the Provincial Congress, stated that they were devoted friends to their bleeding country; that they were afflicted by beholding her struggling under heavy loads of oppression and tyranny, and the more so, when they viewed the iron hand lifted up against her; that their Prince was deaf to *Petitions* for interposing his Royal authority for redressing their grievances; that one year had not sufficed to satisfy the rage of a cruel Ministry, in their bloody pursuits designed to reduce them to be slaves taxed by them, without their consent; that, therefore, they rather wished to separate from, than to continue connected with, such oppressors; and they declared that if the Provincial Congress should think proper to instruct their Delegates in the Continental Congress to use their utmost endeavors, in that august assembly, to cause these United Colonies to become independent of Great Britain, it would give them the highest satisfaction; and they sincerely promised to support the same with their lives and fortunes.[1]

A snow-storm in Summer would not have been more unwelcome to the cultivators of the soil, than that *Address* was to the Provincial Congress, since Independence and the much coveted Reconciliation with Great Britain were wholly irreconcilable; and, without even the usual courtesy of a consideration of either the *Address* or the very important subject to which it related, by a Committee of the Congress—why should "the poor reptiles" who had written and presented such an *Address* receive such attention and enjoy such consideration as a reference of their *Address* and of their plea to a Committee of the Congress, would have indicated, although such a reference was usual and nothing more than respectful in matters of so much importance?—an *Answer* was made by the President of the Congress, orally; and a copy of it was evidently given to Lewis Thibou [*Louis Tiebout,?*] by whom the *Address* had been read, at the head of "a number of citizens who style "themselves a 'Committee of Mechanics,'" before the Provincial Congress itself.

As the "oligarchy" which constituted that Congress had resorted to the extraordinary precaution of requiring the proposed *Address* to be delivered to it, for its "inspection," in order that that aristocratic body should "discover whether it is proper for this "Congress to receive the same"—the bearers of it, meanwhile, dancing an attendance, outside, before a closed door—before it would permit the Mechanics to enter the Chamber in which it was sitting, to present their *Address* and to read it, there had been ample time to prepare the *Answer*, in season for the oral delivery of it, from the Chair; and there was one Deputy present, and only one, who was capable of writing that *Answer*, in the terms in which it was constituted.[2]

That *Answer* was in these remarkable words:

"In Provincial Congress, June 4, 1776.

"Sir:

"We consider the Mechanics in Union as a volun-"tary Association of a number of the inhabitants of "this City, who are warmly attached to the cause of "Liberty. We flatter ourselves, however, that neither "that Association nor their Committee will claim any "authority, whatsoever, in the public transactions of "the present times; but that, on the contrary, they "will ever be ready to submit to that constitutional "authority which, by a free election, has been vested "in Congress and Committees.

"This Congress is, at all times, ready and willing "to attend to every request of their constituents, or "of any part of them: we are of opinion that the "Continental Congress, alone, have that enlarged "view of our political circumstances which will ena-"ble them to decide upon those measures which are "necessary for the general welfare: we cannot pre-"sume, by any instructions, to make or declare any "Resolutions or Declarations, upon a so general and "momentous concern: but are determined patiently "to await and firmly to abide by whatever a majority "of that august body shall think needful. We, there-"fore, cannot presume to instruct the Delegates of "this Colony, upon the momentous question to which "your Address refers, until we are informed that it is "brought before the Continental Congress and the "sense of this Colony be required through this Con-"gress."[3]

To that contemptuous *Answer*, the Mechanics in Union, ten days afterwards, [*June* 14, 1776.] sent a second *Address*, in reply, in which, under cover of an inquiry concerning one of the Resolutions of the Provincial Congress relating to a proposed establish-

[1] *Journal of the Provincial Congress*, "Die Martis, 9 ho., A.M., June 4, "1776."

[2] John Jay was not in his seat, in the Provincial Congress, during that entire day; and, therefore, he had no hand in it. John Morin Scott was present; but no one will pretend that such a sturdy sycophant of the popular element as he, would have ventured to have written such a paper, so contemptuously disrespectful of that great class of generally unfranchised Working men. The President of the Congress, General Woodhull, of Suffolk, was not handy with the pen; and he possessed no such animosity against "the lower classes," as is seen in this *Answer*. It remained, therefore, to the high toned, "well born" Deputy from Westchester-county, Gouverneur Morris—the same who had stood in the window of the Coffee-house, on the nineteenth of May, 1774, and, thence, had studied the rising power of the democracy, whom he loathed *—to write the Answer of the Congress; and it was, unquestionably, he who did it.

[3] *Journal of the Provincial Congress*, "Die Martis, 9 ho., A.M., June 4, "1776."

* Vide page 12, ante.

ment of a new form of Government, but in words and in terms which entitled the Artisan-author of it to the highest honors, the generally unfranchised Workingmen of the City of New York manfully declared their Rights, as a portion of that body of the People, throughout the Colony, in whom, they considered, were vested the *original* power and the source of all political authority, within the Colony; denounced the assumption, by either of the Congresses or any of the Committees, of an authority over and beyond that which had been delegated to them, as illegal and destructive of the ends sought to be secured by the creation of those several bodies; and warning the Provincial Congress of the necessary consequences of such an usurpation. That *Reply*, most respectful in its tone while it was most overwhelming in its facts and in its argument, was evidently not permitted to be presented to the Provincial Congress; and, without the slightest notice on the official *Journal* of that body—probably, without the slightest official action by the Congress—it was buried in the files of that "oligarchic" body, to await a resurrection in these later days.[1]

On the following day, [*June* 5, 1776,] the Provincial Congress was pestered, again, with that obnoxious subject of Independence; but, on that occasion, the aristocratic Colonial Convention of Virginia was the unwelcome claimant on its attention; and, consequently, it was constrained to be more civil in its words and more respectful in its demeanor than it had been, on the day before, when the plebeian Workingmen of the City in which it was seated had addressed it, respectfully, on the same subject.

The message which the letter of Edmund Pendleton had conveyed to the Provincial Congress was the celebrated and well-known Resolutions of that Convention, adopted on the fifteenth of May preceding, through which the Delegation from Virginia, in the Continental Congress, was *instructed* "to declare the "United Colonies free and independent States, absolved from all allegiance to or dependence upon "the Crown and Parliament of Great Britain; and "that it give the assent of this Colony to such Declaration, and to whatever measures may be thought "proper and necessary, by the Congress, for forming "foreign alliances and a Confederation of the Colonies, "at such time and in the manner as to them shall seem "best; PROVIDED, That the power of forming Government for and the regulation of the internal concerns "of each Colony be left to the respective Colonial "Legislatures;"[2] and the Provincial Congress ordered "that John Jay and Gouverneur Morris be a Committee to prepare a draft of an answer to it, and to "report the same"[3]—without the usual injunction, "with all convenient speed," however, since the Provincial Congress was not in a hurry to consider the subject of Independence; and it would not be so, at least until what it evidently preferred, the question of Reconciliation, should have been met and finally disposed of.

On the afternoon of the day succeeding that on which the Resolutions from Virginia had been received, [*June* 6, 1776,] the Committee to whom those Resolutions had been referred, reported an answer to the letter of Edmund Pendleton which had covered them—an answer which was just as icy cold and formal as the *Answer* to "the Mechanics in Union," two days before, had been; and which told, as distinctly as the other had told, how entirely obnoxious to the aristocratic leaders of the Rebellion, in New York, the proposition for Independence from Great Britain had been. It simply acknowledged the receipt of the Resolutions and that of the letter which had covered them, saying, also, that they had been communicated to the Provincial Congress, by whom "they would be "considered with all the deliberation due to the importance of the subject;" that the Congress thanked the Convention of Virginia for its attention; and that the latter was "assured that the Congress of this Colony will invariably adopt and pursue every measure "which may tend to promote the union and secure "the rights and happiness of the United Colonies."[4]

Four days after the Resolutions of the Convention

[1] This admirable *Reply* to the *Answer* of the Provincial Congress, which was more especially devoted to the proposal of that body to impose a new form of Government on the Colony or State, without having submitted it to the body of the People, for ratification or rejection, was in these words:

* * * * * * * * * *

[2] *Journal of a Convention of Delegates from the Counties and Corporations in the Colony of Virginia, held at the Capitol, in the City of Williamsburgh*, "Wednesday May 15, 1776."

[3] *Journal of the Provincial Congress*, "Die Mercurii, 9 ho., A.M., June "5, 1776."

[4] *Journal of the Provincial Congress*, "Die Jovis, 9 ho., A.M., June 6, "1776."

With this simple record of one of the coldest specimens of polite disagreement with another, on record, before him, the reader will hardly be prepared to read what Bancroft has written of the reception of the Resolutions from Virginia and of John Jay's treatment of them. His words were these: "But early in June, the New York Congress had to pass "upon the Virginia proposition of Independence. This was the moment "that showed the firmness and the purity of Jay; the darker the hour, "the more he stood ready to cheer; the greater the danger, the more "promptly he stepped forward to guide. He had insisted on the doubtful measure of a second *Petition to the King* with no latent weakness of "purpose or cowardice of heart. The hope of obtaining redress had "gone; he could, now, with perfect peace of mind, give free scope to the "earnestness of his convictions. Though it had been necessary for him "to perish as a martyr, he could not and he would not swerve from his "sense of duty."—(*History of the United States*, original edition, viii., 459; *the same*, centenary edition, v., 305.)

The entire reply to the Convention of Virginia, excluding the date and the signature, occupies twelve lines of a narrow column, including the half-lines of two paragraphs. All which it contained, concerning Independence, was a formal acknowledgment of the receipt of the letter and of the Resolutions, "which were immediately communicated to the Congress of this Colony, and will be considered by them with all the deliberation due to the importance of the subject." Nothing more than that was said or done, on the subject of Independence, in connection with the Resolutions from Virginia, nor in connection with anything else, relative to that subject, until the Congress was crowded into a consideration of it, by an entirely different agency, several days afterwards.

Yet this is "history," as Bancroft understands the meaning of that term.

of Virginia had been thus quieted, [*June* 10, 1776,] the Provincial Congress was further vexed, on the growing subject of Independence, by the receipt of the following brief note from those of the Delegates of the Colony who were, then, in Philadelphia:

"PHILADELPHIA, June 8, 1776.

"DEAR SIR:

"Your Delegates, here, expect that the question of "Independence will, very shortly, be agitated in "Congress. Some of us consider ourselves as bound "by our instructions not to vote on that question; "and all of us wish to have your sentiments thereon.

"The matter will admit of no delay; we have, "therefore, sent an express who will wait your "orders.

"We are, Sir, with the greatest respect,

"Your most obt. hum. servts.

"WILLIAM FLOYD,
"HENRY WISNER,
"ROBT. R. LIVINGSTON,
"FRANS. LEWIS.

"TO NATHANIEL WOODHULL, ESQ., PREST.
"OF THE HON. THE CONVENTION OF NEW-YORK."[1]

This letter was received, early in the morning, and the Provincial Congress, very-leisurely, read it, in secret Session; and, notwithstanding the urgency for speedy action which accompanied it, that was all which was done, concerning Independence, at that Session.[2] Late in the afternoon, the Congress very leisurely returned to the subject; and, then, it indulged itself by hearing the reading of the letter, a second time; by listening, while the Clerk read the powers of the Provincial Congress, which were very briefly presented in the Resolutions calling for the election of its members;[3] and by hearing the same stately official read the powers of the Delegates of the Colony in the Continental Congress,[4] closing its desperate effort to make haste slowly, in spending "some time, "in the consideration of the letter" of the Delegation,[5] without, however, taking any action whatever, on it or on the subject to which it referred.

Nothing whatever was done by the Provincial Congress, concerning the letter of the Delegates nor concerning Independence, on the following morning, [*June* 11, 1776;][6] but, during the afternoon of that day, with that peculiar disregard for those with whom he was associated which invariably distinguished John Jay from all others, that Deputy presented "several Resolutions on the subject of Independence," which were seconded by Colonel Henry Remsen, of the City of New York, "again read by "paragraphs, amended, and agreed to, and are in the "words following, to wit:[7]

"RESOLVED, UNANIMOUSLY, That the good people "of this Colony have not, in the opinion of this "Congress, authorized this Congress or the Delegates "of this Colony in the Continental Congress to de-"clare this Colony to be and continue independent of "the Crown of Great Britain.

"BUT WHEREAS the perseverance of the British "King and Parliament, in an unjustifiable attempt to "subjugate and enslave these United Colonies, may "render a determination on that and many other im-"portant points highly necessary and expedient, and "a recurrence to the people at large, for their senti-"ments on every great question that may occur in "the course of the present contest would be very "inconvenient to them, and probably be attended "with dangerous delay:

"RESOLVED, UNANIMOUSLY, therefore, That it be "and it is hereby earnestly recommended to all the "Freeholders and other Electors in this Colony, at "the ensuing Election to be held in pursuance of a "Resolution of the Congress of the thirty-first day of "May last past, not only to vest their Representa-"tives or Deputies with the powers therein men-"tioned, but also with full power to deliberate and "determine on every question whatever that may "concern or affect the interest of this Colony, and to "conclude upon, ordain, and execute every act and "measure which, to them, shall appear conducive to "the happiness, security, and welfare of this Colony; "and that they hold and exercise the said powers until "the second Tuesday of May next, or until a regular "form of Government for this Colony shall be estab-

[1] *Journal of the Provincial Congress*, "Die Lunæ, 9 ho., A.M., June 10, "1776."

[2] Ibid.

[3] It was stated in the Credentials of the Deputies from Orange-county that the Resolutions of the second Provincial Congress, providing for the election of the third Provincial Congress and defining its authority, were adopted on the twelfth of March preceding; but there is no mention of the adoption of any Resolutions whatever, on that subject, on that or any other day, on the published *Journal of the second Provincial Congress*.

Again: we have not found on that *Journal*, any definition of the authority of the third of those Congresses—that authority which, in the text, the Secretary is said to have read, on the afternoon of the tenth of June—but the Credentials of the Deputies from Kings-county, compared with those of the Deputies from Orange-county, indicate that the authority sought to be delegated to that third Provincial Congress by its constituent Counties, under the Resolutions providing for their election, included "full powers, in behalf of the said County, to appoint Delegates "to represent the Colony in the Continental Congress, and to make such "orders and take such measures as they shall judge necessary, not repug-"nant to or inconsistent with any Rules or Orders of the Continental "Congress, for the preservation of the Rights, Liberties and Privileges of "the inhabitants of this Colony."

These, or their equivalents, were, undoubtedly, what the Secretary read to the Provincial Congress, as stated in the text.

[4] "The powers of the Delegates at Continental Congress," which until it became convenient to refer to them in order to promote a selfish end, had remained unnoticed, were recited in their *Credentials*, in the following few words: * * * "to meet the Delegates from the other Colo-"nies, and to concert and determine upon such measures as shall be "judged most effectual for the preservation and re-establishment of "American rights and privileges, and for the restoration of harmony "between Great Britain and the Colonies," (*Journal of the Provincial Convention*, "Die Sabbati, 11 hora, A.M., April 22, 1775; *Journal of the Continental Congress*, "Thursday, May 11, 1775.")

[5] *Journal of the Provincial Congress*, "Monday, 5 P.M., June 10, 1776."

[6] *Journal of the Provincial Congress*, "Tuesday morning, New-York, June "11, 1776."

[7] *Journal of the Provincial Congress*, "Tuesday, P.M., June 11, 1776."

"lished, in case that event shall sooner take place. "And it is further recommended to the said Free-"holders and Electors, by instructions or otherwise, "to inform their said Deputies of their sentiments "relative to the great question of Independency and "such other points as they may think proper."[1]

It needs very little of knowledge in the science of politics to distinguish, in these Resolutions, a proposal that those of the Colonists, in New York, who were not already proscribed and enslaved by the Resolutions of the Provincial Congress adopted on the fifth of June, six days preceding the adoption of these Resolutions,[2] should debase themselves and voluntarily become unqualified serfs, before, and entirely subject to, as absolute and unbridled a despotism as ever existed; and that knowledge will serve, also, to distinguish the author and supporters of such Resolutions, notwithstanding the gauzy masks which ill-supported their shallow pretensions to personal and political integrity, as nothing else than monarchists of the most pronounced school of absolutism, provided, always, they should, themselves, be seated very near to the throne. There was an appendage to those Resolutions, which rendered the entire movement still more remarkable; and the facts are not the less significant because those who have written of the Resolutions and of those who wrote them and promoted their passage through the Provincial Congress, have studiously concealed not only the license for a despotism which they contained, but, also, that secret appendage which made entirely inoperative all the provisions which they contained on the subject of the proposed Independence of the Colonies from the Mother Country.

The controlling appendage, to which we allude and which has not been heretofore noticed by any historical writer, was an *Agreement* which was made between the members of the Provincial Congress who were then present, John Jay having been of the number and unquestionably the leader in the movement, "That the publishing of the aforegoing Resolves "be postponed until after the Election of Deputies "with powers to establish a new form of Govern-"ment"[3]—that is to say, they were not to be made known to the Freeholders and other voters, until after the Election at which the subject of the proposed Independence, was, by virtue of these Resolutions, to be submitted to the Electors, at the Polls, should have been held.

A reference to the Resolutions will show to the reader that, although the question of Independence formed the basis as well as the top-stone of the structure, they were so contrived that, notwithstanding that question seemed to have been submitted to the judgment of the Electors, at the Polls, that grave subject was really made dependent, among the various other matters of government of which the Electors were audaciously asked to divest themselves, on the unrestrained, despotic will of the Provincial Congress itself; and, at the same time, the entire subject was made "a rider," as parliamentarians call such motions, which was to be "saddled" on an Order which had been already made, for an Election, and for an entirely different purpose. All these, because they were open and intelligible to every sensible Elector, were well enough; and every such Elector, under the closing paragraph of the last Resolution, might be reasonably expected, "by instructions or otherwise, to in-"form his Deputy of his sentiments relative to the "great question of Independency and such other "points as he might think proper," the aggregate of which "instructions" might be regarded as a reasonable indication of the will of those who had given them, on the great questions of a new form of Government and of Independence, without, however, possessing any controlling power over the oligarchic Provincial Congress, who might, nevertheless, regard or disregard that expressed will of its constituents whenever and to whatever extent it own unrestrained will should determine, the Resolutions themselves, meanwhile, affording a license to those Delegates who remained in the Continental Congress, to continue to withhold the assent of the Colony of New York to whatever action should be taken, relative to Independence, in that body. We say, all these were well enough, because they were open and intelligible; and if the question of Independence had been, thereby, submitted, even indirectly and insufficiently, to the arbitrament of the Electors, there would have been an appearance, at least, of fairness and consistency; but John Jay had no such intention—he aimed, mainly, to hoodwink those, in the Continental Congress, who were anxiously desiring the support of New York in their effort to crowd the question of Independence through that body, by a seeming fairness on that subject; while, at the same time, by a secret *Agreement* (an action, by a parliamentary body, which was unknown to parliamentary law, and without a precedent,) all

[1] By inuendo, if not directly, Bancroft, by making no mention of the letter of the Delegation of the Colony in the Continental Congress, leads his readers to suppose that these Resolutions were the outcome of the Resolutions of the Convention of Virginia, which had been disposed of, as we have seen, several days previously and in a lesser number of words.

The same writer describes these Resolutions, after the rhetorical flourish, concerning the author of them, which we have elsewhere quoted, as "calling upon the Freeholders and Electors of the Colony to confer "on the Deputies whom they were about to choose full powers of admin-"istering Government, framing a Constitution, and deciding the great "question of Independence," (*History of the United States*, original edition, viii., 440; *the same*, centennial edition, v., 305.)

The venerable author saw nothing of that absolute despotism, involving "every question whatever," civil or ecclesiastical or military, affecting not only individuals but the aggregate body of the inhabitants of the entire Colony, which those Resolutions clearly and definitely established; and his eyes saw nothing whatever of that *Agreement* which was appended to them, which entirely dispose of his rhetoric, and, as we shall presently see, present John Jay in a somewhat different light.

[2] Vide pages 167–171, ante.

[3] *Journal of the Provincial Congress*, "Tuesday, P.M., June 11, 1776."

that he and the Provincial Congress had done or pretended to have done, thereon, was made inoperative, by withholding from the Electors, until after the Election at which the Resolutions were ordered to be submitted to the judgment of those Electors, all knowledge of the existence of any such Resolutions!

If the Provincial Congress possessed no authority, legal or revolutionary, "to declare this Colony to be "and continue independent of the Crown of Great "Britain," as both common sense and history, as well as the first of John Jay's series of enabling Resolutions, unquestionably determined, those enabling Resolutions, carefully concealed and rendered entirely inoperative by the *Agreement* which was subsequently appended to them, assuredly did not supply nor provide for a supply of that peculiar authority which John Jay and the Provincial Congress, *then*, regarded as necessary, for a warrant for such a declaration; and, consequently, that Congress was, and would necessarily continue to be, as it had previously been, without the slightest authority, legal or revolutionary, to take any action whatever, which tended toward a separation of the Colony from the Mother Country. The carefully concealed *Agreement* accomplished the evident purposes of its treacherous authors, however; and the Delegation of the Colony in the Continental Congress, at the same time, was enabled, by it, to make its opposition, in that body, to the *Resolution* and the *Declaration of Independence*, less offensive to the majority of that Congress and to the revolutionary elements throughout the Continent; but, notwithstanding these successes, those Resolutions, as well as the *Agreement* which was appended to them, were deceptive and fraudulent in their character, and intended by their author and promoters for nothing else than for the advancement of deceptive and fraudulent purposes. The reader will see, very soon, with what little respect the declaration which formed the basis of those Resolutions, as well as the Resolutions themselves, was regarded by the same John Jay and by nearly the same Provincial Congress—then as deficient in authority "to declare "this Colony to be and continue independent of the "Crown of Great Britain," as it had been, twenty-eight days previously—when, on the ninth of July succeeding, they actually did declare this Colony to be and continue independent of the Mother Country, their acknowledged want of authority, from any source, to do any such action, to the contrary not withstanding.

Were there any doubt, in any mind, concerning John Jay's entire capability of practising the most refined deceit and of being most unqualifiedly treacherous, whenever his own selfish or partisan purposes could be most successfully promoted by deceit and treachery, such a doubt would be surely removed by a knowledge of that remarkable transaction—the adoption of a series of Resolutions, for the seeming promotion of a specific purpose, while, secretly, at the same time, he entered into an *Agreement* with other persons, by means of the provisions of which *Agreement*, secretly executed, the Resolutions were made inoperative, and the seeming support which they appeared to extend to the question of Independence, at the same time, was converted into an illusion and a cheat—which we have described. John Jay and all those with whom he was associated, in the great political questions of that period, were aiming at something else than Independence, at something which was directly antagonistic to Independence; and he and they felt at liberty, under the license of that unholy ambition which controlled them, to resort to and to employ whatever means, of whatever character, which would promote their controlling purpose of keeping the Colony of New York out of the current which was evidently setting toward Independence, and in a continued political and commercial dependence on Great Britain. Whether others will justify either the fraud or those who perpetrated it, is a matter in which we have no concern.

Having thus disposed of its unwelcome guest, the Provincial Congress appointed John Jay and "Col-"onel a Committee to draft an answer to the "letter of the Delegates in the Continental Congress," which had been the basis of all the proceedings which are now under consideration; and it is probable that such an answer, conveying a copy of the *Resolutions*, but evidently not one of the *Agreement*, was sent to the Delegates, on the afternoon of the day on which the *Resolutions* were adopted, although no mention was made of any such answer in the *Journal of the Provincial Congress*—the files of that body, however, contain a letter from the Delegates, dated on the seventeenth of June and addressed to the President of the Provincial Congress, acknowledging the receipt of two letters, of different dates, in one of which "the "sentiments of the Hon. the Convention relative to "the important subject on which we thought it our "duty to ask their opinion," had been transmitted, was duly acknowledged.[1]

No further action, of any kind, concerning Independence, was taken by the Provincial Congress; and, guided by the restricted authority expressed on its *Credentials* and by the *Resolutions* which are now under consideration, without having been told of the treacherous *Agreement*, the Delegation in the Continental Congress continued to withhold the assent of New York to the *Resolution of Independence*, adopted by that body, on the second of July, and to the *Declaration* which it approved, two days afterwards.

During the very brief period of the existence of the third Provincial Congress, besides those general enactments in which its conservative farmers were more than ordinarily interested, Westchester-county was, sometimes, made the especial object of the

[1] *Francis Lewis, Robert R. Livingston, John Alsop, William Floyd, and Henry Wisner to Hon. Nathaniel Woodhull, President, etc.*, "PHILADELPHIA, "17 June, 1776."

attentions of that body. An instance of that class of special doings may be seen in the *Order* which was made by the Provincial Congress, on the twenty-first of May, in these words: "ORDERED, That Colonel "Ritzema send such prudent Officer as he shall think "proper, to Westchester-county, to apply to the "Chairman of the County Committee and to the re-"spective Sub-committees, in that County, for such "good Arms, fit for soldiers' use, as they may have "collected by disarming disaffected persons, in that "County; and the respective Committees are hereby "requested to deliver such of those Arms as are fit "for the Army, to such Officer, taking and preserving "his receipts for the same: that the said Committees, "respectively, take care that all such Arms be "appraised, and an account of the value of each kept "agreeable to the directions heretofore given for that "purpose; and such Officer as Colonel Ritzema shall "send to collect those Arms is hereby directed to de-"liver all such Arms as he shall so receive, to Colonel "Curtenius, that they may be repaired, where it may "be necessary."[1]

It is not now known how many Arms were thus transferred to the Provincial Storekeeper; nor from whom they had been impressed; nor what disposition was subsequently made of them. But, because the Third Regiment of the New York Line in the Continental Army, which was commanded by Colonel Ritzema, was one of those, under General Alexander McDougal, who were engaged with the Royal Army, on Chatterton's Hill, a few months afterwards, and because Colonel Ritzema's Regiment was undoubtedly supplied with Arms, as far as they went, from those which had been "impressed" in Westchester-county and were thus called in—although the Provincial Congress had disallowed the Resolution of the Committee of Safety, under which these Arms had been forcibly taken from their respective owners, it will be seen that the Arms which had been thus seized were not returned to those from whom they had been taken—there was evidently a master-hand so skilfully directing the progress of events that those Arms which had been thus violently and illegally and wrongly taken from the farmers of Westchester-county were taken back to that County, to be employed in the defense of it, against the assaults of the common enemy.

On the twenty-ninth of May, Colonel Thomas Thomas informed the Provincial Congress that Elijah Hunter, who had been Second Lieutenant in Captain Mills's Company, from Bedford, during the Campaign of 1775,[2] and who was a member of the County Committee of 1776-77,[3] representing that Town, was desirous of raising a Grenadier Company, to be attached to the Regiment of Westchester-county Militia, of which Thomas was the Colonel; and it was intended that, of that Company, Elijah Hunter should be the Captain;[4] Richard Sackett, the First Lieutenant;[5] Silas Miller, the Second Lieutenant;[5] and Jeremiah Lounsberry the Ensign.[5] The Colonel also solicited Commissions for all these aspirants to official authority, although there was not the slightest pretense that a single Private had been enlisted; and, of course, since a Thomas had made the request, the Commissions were "immediately issued to those gentlemen."[6]

On the first of June 1776, the Continental Congress made a requisition for six thousand men from the Colonies of New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Connecticut, and New York, "to be employed to reinforce "the Army in Canada and to keep up the communi-"cation with that Province;"[7] on the third of June, a second requisition was made, by the same Congress, for thirteen thousand, eight hundred men from the Colonies of Massachusetts, Connecticut, New York, and New Jersey, "to be employed to reinforce the "Army at New York;"[8] the eleven Battalions already "raised and ordered to be raised for the protec-"tion of the four New England Colonies," were declared to be "sufficient," for that purpose;[9] and a third requisition was also made for ten thousand men from the Colonies of Pennsylvania, Delaware, and Maryland, "for a Flying Camp, to be immediately "established in the Middle Colonies."[10]

Of these several requisitions, one Battalion of seven hundred and fifty men was called from the Colony of New York, for the Canadian service;[11] and for the reinforcement of the Army at New York, that Colony was required to furnish three thousand men.[12] All were to be taken from the Militia of the respective Colonies; all were to be "engaged" only "to the first "day of December next, unless sooner discharged by "Congress;" and the pay of the men was to commence on the days on which they respectively left their homes.[13]

---

[1] *Journal of the Provincial Congress*, "Die Martis, 10 ho., A.M., May 21, "1776."

[2] Vide pages 100, 101, ante.

[3] *Members of a Committee for Westchester-county—Historical Manuscripts*, etc.: *Miscellaneous Papers*, xxxviii., 309.

[4] Elijah Hunter was evidently an ambitious man. In addition to the Commission, referred to in the text, he managed, on the twenty-first of November, 1776, to obtain the command of the Sixth Company of the Second, or Van Cortlandt's, Regiment of the New York Line, in the Continental Army of 1776-77, (*Historical Manuscripts*, etc.: *Military Committee*, xxv., 761;) and he retired from the service, fifteen days afterwards, (*Historical Manuscripts*, etc.: *Military Committee*, xxv., 851, 854, xxxv., 321;) contenting himself, thenceforth, as we shall see, hereafter, with hankering after authority to continue the persecution of his peaceful neighbors, which Ezekiel Hawley had previously failed to secure. (*Vide pages* 174-177, *ante.*)

[5] Of Richard Sackett, Silas Miller, and Jeremiah Lounsberry no other mention than this appears to have been made, on the military records of the Colony or State. It is probable they were stars of the smallest magnitude.

[6] *Journal of the Provincial Congress*, "Die Mercurii, 9 ho., A.M., May "29, 1776."

[7] *Journal of the Continental Congress*, "Saturday, June 1, 1776."

[8] *The same*, "Monday, June 3, 1776."

[9] Ibid.

[10] Ibid.

[11] *Journal of the Continental Congress*, "Saturday, June 1, 1776."

[12] *The same*, "Monday, June 3, 1776."

[13] Ibid.

Of the nine Provincial Brigadier-generals which these requisitions would bring into the service, one was assigned to the Colony of New York;[1] and, as will be seen, hereafter, a lively canvass for the place was immediately commenced by John Morin Scott, of the City of New York, and by the President of the Provincial Congress, Brigadier-general Nathaniel Woodhull, of Suffolk.

These several requisitions, with an elaborate appeal from the President of the Continental Congress, were laid before the Provincial Congress of New York, on the morning of the seventh of June;[2] and on the afternoon of the same day, a Committee who had been appointed for the purpose, during the morning session, made a Report, apportioning the requisitions which had been made by the Continental Congress on the Colony of New York, in due proportions, on the several Counties, the number apportioned to Westchester-county having been three hundred men.[3] On the following Sunday afternoon, the levies which had been made on Westchester and Orange counties and Suffolk were ordered to constitute one Battalion; and, for that Battalion, Westchester-county was ordered to appoint or nominate, one Colonel, four Captains, four First Lieutenants, and four Second Lieutenants.[4]

Although the Provincial Congress was "of opinion "that the several levies," apportioned on the different Counties, "consisting of volunteers, would be most "advancive of the public service, yet" it evidently knew that volunteers could not be had, even under such a stress of circumstances as then existed and in so "glorious a cause;" and drafts from the respective Regiments, in each County, were also provided for, in instances where deficiencies should be found; and every possible measure was employed, to secure the armament and general equipment of the men.[5]

Information had no sooner been received by the Provincial Congress of New York, that a Brigadier-general was to be appointed by that body, for the command of the four Battalions which were to be raised in New York, than it was announced "the "Congress conceived it necessary towards carrying "the several Resolutions and requisitions of the "Continental Congress into execution, to appoint a "Brigadier-general and a Major of Brigade of the "Militia of Westchester-county"—the Congress did not reveal in what that declared "necessity" existed, however; and as those offices had been created on the twenty-second of the preceding August[6] and had not been occupied, during the entire intervening period, while neither pay nor emoluments were derivable from them, it is very evident that that Brigadier-general and that Major of Brigade became a "necessity," very suddenly, and only when a contingent possibility appeared that they, if they were already in place, might receive the appointments to the new-created offices of the same respective ranks, in the Brigade of Militia which the Continental Congress had called into the service of the Continent, with the honors, the pay, the emoluments, and the increased social and political influences which they would certainly ensure. Not a moment was lost, therefore—the Congress was not even permitted to refer the letter from the President of the Continental Congress and the exceedingly important enclosures which it covered, to a Committee, for consideration and report—when, with indecent haste, some ready made Certificates which had evidently been kept on hand, ready for immediate use, whenever they should be needed, were laid before the Provincial Congress, showing that, in the opinion of the enlightened County Committee, in Westchester-county, Lewis Morris was just the man for a Brigadier-general's command, and that Lewis Morris, Junior, could not be excelled as a Major of Brigade. With such intelligent judges of military matters and of the requirements of those who were to command and handle large bodies of soldiers, as were seen in the rustic Committee of the County of Westchester, 1776–77, and with Gouverneur Morris, the step-brother and uncle of the two ambitious Westchesterians, present, and directing the work, how could the Provincial Congress do less than to elect them? The record says, "the Congress conceive it necessary towards carrying "these Resolutions of the Continental Congress into "execution, to appoint a Brigadier-general and a "Major of Brigade of the Militia of Westchester-"county; and Lewis Morris, Esqr., being thought the "most proper person for a Brigadier-general of the "Militia of that County,[7] and having been recom-"mended by the County Committee, for that pur-"pose, and Lewis Morris, Junior, Esqr., having been "also formerly recommended by the said Committee "for an appointment, to be the Major of Brigade of "the Militia of that County;

"RESOLVED: That Lewis Morris, Esqr., be ap-"pointed Brigadier-general of the Militia of the "County of Westchester, and that Lewis Morris, "Junr., Esqr., be appointed Major of Brigade of the "Militia of the said County."

The Secretaries were ordered to engross the Commissions; and that, properly attested, those Commissions be "sent to those gentlemen with all possible

[1] *Journal of the Continental Congress*, "Monday, June 3, 1776."

[2] *Journal of the Provincial Congress*, "Friday morning, 9 ho., June 7, "1776."

[3] *Journal of the Provincial Congress*, "Die Veneris, 4 ho., P.M., June 7, "1776."

[4] *Journal of the Provincial Congress*, "Sunday afternoon, June 9, 1776."

[5] Ibid.

[6] Vide page 102, ante.

[7] As the *Militia Bill* which the Provincial Congress had adopted on the twenty-second of August, 1775, had massed "the Militia of the Counties "of Duchess and Westchester" [*into*] "one other Brigade," it would seem that Duchess-county ought to have been consulted, in this matter; but, very evidently, it was not.

"despatch,"[1] although the Offices were only those of the Militia, not in active service and, with a small exception, not likely to be so. The "despatch" was "necessary," however, since a full-fledged Brigadier-general would be a more imposing candidate, when the election should be held for the Brigadier-general of the four Battalions who had been called into the service of the Continent; and it was not a characteristic of the Morris family to be backward when its own interests required attention and action, at the front. We shall see, hereafter, how well this well-laid scheme was counter-schemed by more astute aspirants; how General Lewis Morris reaped all his military honors, what there were of them, in the Militia of Westchester-county;[2] and that Brigade-major Lewis Morris, Junior, secured all the laurels which he possessed, as an Aide of General Greene, a place for which he was indebted to the personal favor of that Officer.

Two days after the unseemly movement of the Morrises, [*June* 9, 1776,] the Provincial Congress proceeded to the election of a Brigadier-general for the command of the three thousand men who had been called from the Militia of New York, for the reinforcement of the Continental Army, under General Washington, who was then in that Colony; but General Lewis Morris, notwithstanding his artfulness—that species of "art" of which his step-brother, Gouverneur, had written to Mr. Penn, in May, 1774—was not even mentioned—even Westchester-county indicated that he was not a favorite, beyond a known limit; and its Deputation in the Provincial Congress did not pander to his inordinate ambition. The canvass was, indeed, confined to two candidates, John Morin Scott, of the City of New York, one of that celebrated "triumvirate" of the earlier periods of the Revolution and a lawyer of the highest standing, and "General"[3] Nathaniel Woodhull, of Suffolk, a veteran of the French and Indian War, and, at the time now under notice, President of the Provincial Congress. The canvass was evidently conducted, as we have already stated, with spirit; but the influence of the Counties of Westchester, New York, Tryon, Charlotte, and Albany, in behalf of Scott, was too great to be overcome by that of the Counties of Orange, Suffolk, Duchess, and Ulster, for Woodhull, the Counties of Richmond, Kings, Queens, Cumberland, and Gloucester having been absent; and the former was thus elected,[4] admirably filling the political demand, but not, in the slightest degree, promising to make the Brigade efficient or useful, as soldiers—like other lawyers, some of them within our acquaintance, the uniform of a General was attractive to him; he secured an office of distinction; and he continued to occupy it, until, on the establishment of the new form of Government, after having been defeated in his canvass for the office of Governor, he was transferred into the more comfortable, if not the more profitable place, of Secretary of State, which he occupied until 1789, and was succeeded by his son, who held the place until 1798.

On the following day, [*June* 10, 1776,] the Provincial Congress elected the Field-officers of the Regiment in which the levies from Westchester-county were to be enrolled; and Samuel Drake, who was then commanding the skeleton Regiment of Westchester-county Minute-men, in the Continental Service,[5] was elected Colonel; John Hulbert, of Suffolk,[6] was elected Lieutenant-colonel; Moses Hetfield, of Orange-county, was elected Major.[7] The Line-officers of the Regiment and the other details of its organization of the Regiment will be noticed, hereafter.

A matter of particular interest to the inhabitants of Westchester-county occurred during the session of the third Provincial Congress; and it may properly be mentioned in this narrative.

It will be remembered that, on the suggestion of General Lee, a Magazine of Provisions was ordered to be established, in Westchester-county; that the Delegates from that County were authorized to purchase, on the account of the Provincial Congress, the Pork and Beef which were desired; that, subsequently, Colonel Gilbert Drake, the Chairman of the County Committee and one of the Deputies from the County, so managed the affair that all the purchases

[1] *Journal of the Provincial Congress*, "Friday morning, 9 ho , June 7, "1776."

[2] Bolton said Lewis Morris was "a Brigadier-general in the Conti-"nental Army;" and in his arrangement of the words, if they mean anything, that he held that Office before he was sent to the Continental Congress of 1775, (*History of Westchester county*, original edition, ii., 312; (*the same*, second edition, ii., 428;) but we find no competent evidence of the truth of the former statement; and evidence is not necessary to show the entire untruth of the latter.

[3] Nathaniel Woodhull appears to have been a Colonel of the Suffolk Militia who was "recommended or nominated to our Deputies in Pro-"vincial Congress for a Brigadier-general," by the Committees of the western Towns in Suffolk, in a meeting held at Smithtown, on the seventh of September, 1775, (*Historical Manuscripts*, etc.: *Military Returns*, xxvi., 216;) but a very careful examination of the *Journals of the Provincial Congress* and of its *Committee of Safety*, from that date until the earliest mention of him as a "Brigadier general" which we have seen, has failed to produce the slightest evidence of his election to that or any other military authority, beyond his Colonelcy. We incline to the opinion, therefore, that, although he commanded the Suffolk and Queens Militia, it was only as the senior Colonel, or Colonel-commandant; and that he was only a "General," "by courtesy," as it was called.

[4] *Journal of the Provincial Congress*, "Sunday Morning, June 9, 1776."

[5] Vide pages 152-154, ante.

[6] It is doubtful if he ever joined the Regiment, (*Colonel Henry B. Livingston to the Committee of Arrangement*, "FISHKILL, 21 Novr., 1776;") and he resigned, on the ninth of December, 1776, (*John Hulbert to the Committee of Arrangement*, "FISH KILL, December 9, 1776.")

William Goforth, who had served honorably in Canada, was elected to the vacancy, (*Minutes of the Committee of Arrangement*, "FISHKILL, "Jany 13, 1777;") but, in February, he declined to continue in the place, (*Philip Van Cortlandt to the Committee of Arrangement*, "FISHKILL, "Feby. 25, 1777.")

[7] Moses Hetfield was Captain of the Company of Minute-men, at Goshen, in September, 1775; (*Historical Manuscripts*, etc.: *Military Returns*, xxvi., 143,) in February, 1776, he was nominated as First Major of the Regiment of Goshen, (*the same*, xxvii., 77;) to which office he was subsequently appointed, (*the same*, xxvii., 135.)

of Flour, Beef, and Pork, with all the golden opportunities for personal profits which were thus afforded, were concentrated in his own hands; that there were, consequently, rival purchasing Agents, by whom and by the shrewd farmers, the prices of those articles were so greatly advanced that the Committee of Safety was constrained to interfere; and that, after the various buyers, on the account of the Congress, had thus secured their several harvests of the official plunder, the authority was suspended, the Magazine, very soon after, being declared unnecessary;[1] and the provisions which had been bought, at high prices, were thrown on the market again, for such prices as, under such circumstances, could be obtained for them, from the Contractors and Commissaries of the Continental Army.[2] Under the Rules of the Provincial Congress, the accounts and the vouchers had to be audited, before the former could be closed; and Colonel Gilbert Drake, who had endeavored to supersede his associates, in making the necessary purchases, could not produce a sufficient amount of those vouchers to balance his accounts—he had received three thousand pounds, in money; fifty pounds of that sum he could not account for; he was mean enough to hesitate, when the missing fifty pounds were officially called for, preferring, rather to go down to posterity, through all time, as a defaulter;[3] and the matter was laid before the Congress, to be patched up, in some way which would spare him from paying the one hundred and twenty-five dollars, which had disappeared, he did not know how.

The subject was one of those which, by hook or by crook, the Secretaries of the Provincial Congress were apt to pass, without making an official record of them; and we have found no mention of it, on the *Journal of the Provincial Congress*, until a special Committee who had been previously appointed "to "take into consideration the case of Colonel Gilbert "Drake, relative to a loss of fifty pounds he sustained "in receiving and paying out the monies deposited in "his hands, for the purpose of purchasing and laying "up in store a certain quantity of salted Pork, pur-"suant to an *Order* of the late Provincial Congress," made its report, on the fifteenth of June. In that Report, the facts were duly recited, very much to the depreciation of the vindictive Colonel's manliness, although it recommended that he be allowed for his loss, and that he be also compensated "for his other "services," the latter having been asked for, by no others of the Deputies who had also traversed the County and had made similar purchases and had been contented with what they had respectively made, in the operations. The Congress declared, as its opinion, "that Colonel Gilbert Drake sustained a loss, which "accrued in receiving and paying out the public "money, in purchasing Pork, by order of the late "Provincial Congress," without, however, assuming the loss referred to; and then it voted the gallant Colonel, "the sum of seventy pounds, as a compensa-"tion for his services, expenses, and commissions, in "purchasing the said Pork, as aforesaid," and leaving him officially "whitewashed," with twenty pounds and what, besides, he had made in the operations, snugly secured in his pocket-book. It was proven, in that instance, that influence was useful, even among "patriots;" and the Chairman of Westchester-county's County Committee, in the same instance, found it well to have been a Drake.[4]

As we have already stated,[5] the third Provincial Congress was alarmed by the entrance of General Howe into the harbor of New York, and precipitately disbanded, without a formal adjournment, although it had previously provided for a reassembling of the Deputies, at the Court House, in the White Plains, on the following Tuesday, [*July* 2, 1776.] As it did not thus resume its work, it ceased to exist; and, whether for good or for evil, the third Provincial Congress and all which it did and all which it failed to do became subjects of history.

* * * * * *

The latter half of the year 1776 was one of the most eventful periods in the history of America, if not in that of the entire civilized world; and in the great drama of political and military events, teeming with immediate interest and with ultimate importance, and occupying only that short half-year, Westchester-county, in New York, and those who were, then, within the limits of that ancient County—the peaceful and industrious farmers whose homes were there, as well those strangers, armed or unarmed, who had gone into the County, no matter for what purpose—occupy places which were, then, as conspicuous as, since the close of that period, they have been well-known, from one extreme of Christendom to the other.

On the second of July,[6] General Howe and the army which he commanded, whose entrance into the harbor of New York, a few days before, has been already noticed,[7] occupied Staten-Island—Richmond-county—with the military and naval forces which he had brought from Halifax, say seven thousand, five hundred, and fifty-six, rank and file, including those

[1] Vide pages 157-159, ante.

[2] *Journal of the Provincial Congress*, "Die Mercurii, 9 ho., A.M., Au-"gust 14, 1776."

[3] Gilbert Drake seemed to care very little for the respect of posterity; and his ill-conduct in the management of his monetary dealings with others, after the establishment of the Peace, led the Grand Jury to indict him, on a charge of extortion, (*Records of the Court*, in manuscript, County-clerk's office, at the White Plains.)

[4] *Journal of the Provincial Congress*, "Die Sabbati, A.M., June 15 "1776."

[5] Vide page 162, ante.

[6] General Howe's *Observations on a pamphlet entitled* Letters to a Nobleman, 47.

See, also, *General Howe to Lord George Germain*, "STATEN ISLAND, 7th "July, 1776;" General Washington to the President of the Continental Congress, "New-York, July 3, 1776."

[7] Vide pages 163, 164, ante.

who were sick;[1] and, as has been already stated, the inhabitants of that beautiful island, remembering the sentence of outlawry which had been pronounced against them, by the Provincial Congress, and the multiplied outrages to which they had been subjected, on warrants of the same body, by those who claimed to be the special defenders of the Rights of Man; and being, also, relieved from apprehensions of a renewal of their sufferings, "testified their "loyalty by all the means in their power," furnishing the new-comers with "fresh Provisions, Carriages, "Horses, etc.,"[2] and meriting, from him, the high praise which General Howe awarded to them, in his despatches to the Home Government.[3]

It is proper that we shall say, in this connection, that General Howe, on his arrival at Sandy-hook, on the twenty-fifth of June, had been met by Governor Tryon and many others, "fast friends to Govern-"ment," from whom he had received "the fullest "information of the state of the rebels," and of their situation and defences, in the City of New York and on Long Island. His inquiries, concerning the face of the country between Gravesend and Brooklyn and concerning the military works which had been thrown up, had afforded information which had been so entirely satisfactory that he had determined to land the Army, at Gravesend, immediately, and to move, from that base, without the slightest delay and with only the small effective force which was then under his command, on the insufficient works which, at that early day, had been constructed in Kings-county. For the prosecution of that purpose, two days after the arrival of the Fleet and the Army, at Sandy Hook, [*July* 1, 1776,] the former had been moved up to Gravesend-bay, now so universally known to New Yorkers as one of their Summer resorts, in order that the troops might be landed, at daybreak, on the following morning, [*July* 2, 1776,] and, thence, make the first movement in the Campaign, against the insignificant works and yet more insignificant force which, at that time, were clustered around Brooklyn.[4]

It is not now known, if it was ever known, what the result of that early movement of the Royal Army would have been, had General Howe's purposes been duly executed; but there can be little doubt that, with no more than the small force which was then under his command and with the reinforcements which an early success would have surely brought to him, from Richmond, Kings, and Queens-counties, the insufficiently armed and ill-appointed handful of half-hearted men whom General Washington commanded or endeavored to command, would have been entirely overcome; and that, thereby, the physical strength of the Rebellion would have been surely broken.[5] But "the bright designs" of God had been directed to an entirely different end; and the uplifted hand of General Howe fell, harmlessly, without striking the meditated and well-aimed and powerful blow—during the night, after the Fleet had anchored in Gravesend-bay, and while the preparations for landing the troops, at the approaching daybreak, were in progress, and while the soldiery, smarting under the disgrace which had befallen it, at Boston, was eagerly preparing to recover its professional respectability, in an encounter, in the field, with those by whom it had been, there, humiliated, somebody, history does not say whom although intelligent conjecture undoubtedly supplies the information, approached the commanding General with "particular information of a strong pass, upon a "ridge of craggy heights, covered with wood, that lay "in the route the Army must take, only two miles "distant from the front of the enemy's encampment "and seven from Gravesend, which the rebels would "undoubtedly occupy before the King's troops could

[1] General Howe's *Observations*, 45.

[2] General Howe's *Observations* 50.

[3] *General Howe to Lord George Germaine*, "STATEN ISLAND, 7th July, "1776." General Howe's *Observations*, 59.

[4] General Washington's means for obtaining intelligence were very defective—how should it have been otherwise, among those whom the Provincial Congress had soured by the outrages inflicted on them or on their neighbors and friends? He was not informed of the arrival of General Howe, until three days after it had occurred; and then only through information received through a prisoner, whom the *Schuyler*, armed sloop had captured.

On the same day on which that intelligence was received by him, General Washington wrote to the Continental Congress: "I could wish "General Howe and his armament not to arrive yet, as not more than "a thousand Militia have come in, and our whole force, including the "troops at all the detached posts and on board the armed vessels, "which are comprehended in our *Returns*, is but small and inconsider-"able when compared with the extensive lines they are to defend and, "most probably, the Army that he brings. I have no further intelli-"gence about him than what the Lieutenant" [*Davison, of the armed* "*sloop* Schuyler] "mentions; but it is extremely probable his accounts "and conjectures are true," (*General Washington to the President of the Continental Congress*, "NEW YORK, 27 June, 1776," *postscript* dated "June "28th."]

On the following day, General Washington wrote thus: "I suppose "the whole fleet will be in, within a day or two." [*It all arrived on that day.*] "I am hopeful, before they are prepared to attack, that I "shall get some reinforcements. Be that as it may, I shall attempt "to make the best disposition I can of our troops, in order to give them "a proper reception, and prevent the ruin and destruction they are "meditating against us," (*General Washington to the President of the Continental Congress*," NEW YORK, 29 June, 1776.")

A few days after General Washington had thus conveyed the intelligence of the weakness of his command, to the Continental Congress, the Adjutant-general of the Army is said to have written to a member of the same Congress, on the same subject, in these words: "With an "Army of force, before, and a secret one, behind, we stand on a point "of land with six thousand old troops, if a year's service of about half "can entitle them to the name, and about fifteen hundred new levies, "of this Province, many disaffected and more doubtful. In this situ-"ation we are: every man in the Army, from the General to the Pri-"vate, acquainted with our true situation, is exceedingly discouraged. "Had I known the true posture of affairs, no consideration would have "tempted me to have taken an active part of this scene; and this sen-"timent is universal." (*Adjutant general Joseph Reed "to a Member of "Congress*," "NEW YORK, July 1, 1776," quoted by Dr. Gordon, in his *History of the Rise, Progress and Establishment of the Independence of the United States of America*, Edition, London: 1788, ii, 278.)

[5] "General Howe is sufficiently strong, considering the goodness of his "troops, to make a successful attempt upon the Americans; but being "in daily expectation of the reinforcements from Europe, he will un-"doubtedly remain inactive till their arrival," (Gordon's *History*, etc., London edition, ii, 278.)

"get up to it; and, from the minutest description, "judging an attack upon this post, so strong by "nature and so near the front of the enemy's works, "to be too hazardous an attempt, before the arrival of "the troops with Commodore Hotham,"[1] [*from Europe*,] "daily expected," the General "declined "the undertaking;" and, consequently, the day-break came and went without the promised debarkation of the Army; the Fleet weighed its anchors, "passed the "Narrows," came too at the watering place, where it again cast its anchors; the Army was landed on Staten Island, as already stated;[2] the first mistake of the Campaign was committed; the first disastrous delay was inaugurated; General Washington and his feeble command were, for the time, spared; and the Rebellion was not suppressed. With an abundant naval force under his command, General Howe commanded and controlled all the waters which were near him; and Gravesend-bay need not have been regarded as the only base which he could have occupied—he could have turned the flank of any or of all the lines, either of hills or of armed rebels, and have landed his command either in front or on the rear of either of the latter, as he should have determined; and he could have led his abundantly supplied, admirably disciplined, and thoroughly willing command to an immediate and effectual success, had not his willing ears listened to those who inclined to Peace, and had not his sympathies controlled his judgment and overcome his sense of duty with the hope that the day of reconciliation—of reconciliation to be secured through himself—was not yet passed. He hesitated; and the golden opportunity passed away, never to be returned.

On the same second of July, and while the Royal Army was thus occupying Staten Island, the Continental Congress, at Philadelphia, was considering the subject of Independence.

* * * * * *

It will be remembered by the reader that, in 1774, when the County of Westchester was invited, by the Committee of Fifty-one, in the City of New York, to unite with that Committee in sending a Delegation to the proposed Congress of the Continent which had been called for the purpose of securing a proper and united opposition to the measures of the Ministry and, as far as possible, a redress of the grievances of the Colonies, the great body of the farmers in that County disregarded that invitation; and that the very few who accepted it, either personally or by their local Committees, assembled at the Court-house, in the White Plains; called one of the principal landholders of the County, who was, also, at that time a Representative of the County in the General Assembly of the Colony, Frederic Philipse by name, to the Chair; and signified the opposition to the measures of the Home Government, of, at least, those who were present, by authorizing the Delegation who had been elected to represent the City and County of New York, to represent, at the same time, the County of Westchester, in that general assemblage of Delegates.[3]

It will be remembered, also, that the General Assembly of the Colony, which was convened in January, 1775, although there was not, within it, a single "friend of the Government," every member having been an avowed member of the party of the Opposition, had presented the lamentable spectacle of a great party divided into factions, each seeking to secure the same great result, but by distinct and radically different means. In the conflicts of factions, in that body, it will be remembered that no more consistent and no more steadfast opponents of the Home and Colonial Governments were seen than the two Representatives of the County of Westchester and the other two, who represented, respectively, the Manor of Cortlandt and the Borough Town of Westchester, although Frederic Philipse, representing the County, and Isaac Wilkins, representing the Borough, were of one faction, and John Thomas, also representing the County, and Pierre Van Cortlandt, representing the Manor of Cortlandt, were of the other and opposing faction.[4]

At the adjournment of the House, in April, 1775, these four gentlemen appeared to have returned to their respective homes, and to have remained there, without immediately participating in the political events of the day, except in the instance of Frederic Philipse and Isaac Wilkins, who, eight days after the adjournment of the General Assembly, united in the *Declaration and Protest* against the assembling of the Provincial Convention for the sole purpose of electing Delegates to a second Congress of the Continent, which *Declaration and Protest* a large number of the inhabitants of the County of Westchester then signed and published.[5]

It will be remembered, also, that among the earliest of those whom the handful of office-seekers, in the interest of themselves and of the Rebellion, proscrib-

[1] Commodore Hotham did not reach New York until the twelfth of August, as will be seen, hereafter.

[2] *General Howe to Lord George Germain*, "STATEN ISLAND, 7th July, "1776."

See, also, [Captain Hall's] *History of the Civil War in America*, i., 174; Stedman's *History of the American War*, i., 190, 191.

Stedman said, "the troops thus landed," [*on Staten Island*,] "consisted "of two Battalions of Light Infantry; two of Grenadiers; the Fourth, "Fifth, Tenth, Seventeenth, Twenty-second, Twenty-third, Twenty-seventh, Thirty-fifth, Thirty-eighth, Fortieth, Forty-second, Forty-third, "Forty-fourth, Forty-fifth, Forty-ninth, Fifty-second, Fifty-sixth, Sixty-"third, and Sixty-fourth Regiments of Foot; parts of the Forty-sixth "and Seventy-first Regiments; and the Seventeenth Regiment of Light "Dragoons. There were, besides, two Companies of Volunteers, raised "at New-York, consisting of one hundred men each. The total amount "was nine thousand men"—in which latter statement, in general terms, he is contradicted by General Howe, in his *Observations*, (*vide pages*, 191, 192, *ante*,) although he gave the aggregate, including the Officers and Staff, while General Howe included only "the Rank and File of his command.

[3] Vide page 32, ante.

[4] Vide pages 48, 49, ante.

[5] Vide pages 72–74, ante.

ed, because of his action in the General Assembly—notwithstanding it was in an earnest opposition to the Ministry and in an equally earnest support of the demands of the Colony for a redress of grievances—because of his *Declaration and Protest* at the White Plains, and, undoubtedly, because of his understood authorship of some political tracts which were obnoxious to the controling political faction, Isaac Wilkins was obliged to seek personal safety in flight—he left his family and his estate and found a refuge in London.[1]

After having spent some months in retirement, Pierre Van Cortlandt resumed his place in the political turmoil of the period; while Frederic Philipse and John Thomas, the former at Yonkers and the other in the Harrison Precinct, are not known to have taken any part whatever, in the partisan operations of that period.

When the spirit of proscription was introduced into Westchester-county, destroying the peace which had previously prevailed among its rural inhabitants, Frederic Philipse was named among those who, without the slightest evidence of any wrong-doing, were to be arrested and dealt with.[2] He does not appear to have been disturbed, however, until the organization of the notorious "Committee to Detect Conspira-"cies," of which mention has been already made;[3] when, at the head of the *List of Suspected Persons, in Westchester-county*, who were designated as the victims of that American Inquisition, was placed the name of "*FREDERIC PHILIPSE×"—the asterisk before the name indicating that he was "to be Sum-"moned;" and the cross which followed the name indicating that he was "to be Arrested."[4]

The *Minutes of the Committee* also indicate that on the twenty-seventh of June, 1776, an Order was made by that body, "That Summonses issue against the "following persons as inimical to the Cause and "rights of America, returnable on Wednesday the "third day of July next at ten o'clock in the forenoon "of the same day, viz: Frederick Philipse and "Samuel Merritt, which said Summonses signed by "all the members present at[4] were delivered to the "Secretary with directions to deliver them to the "messenger to be served."[5]

The Summons thus issued was served on Frederic Philipse, at Philipsborough, the present City of Yonkers, on Saturday evening, the twenty-ninth of June; and, on the following Tuesday, [*July* 2, 1776,] he made the following reply to the Committee:

"PHILIPSBOROUGH, July 2, 1776.

"GENTLEMEN:

"I was served on Saturday evening last with a "paper signed by you, in which you suggest that "you are authorized by the Congress to summon cer-"tain persons to appear before you, whose conduct "had been represented as inimical to the rights of "America, of which number you say I am one.

"Who it is that has made such a representation or "upon what particular facts it is founded, as you have "not stated them, it is impossible for me to imagine; "but, considering my situation and the near and "intimate ties and connexions which I have in this "country,[6] which can be secured and rendered

[1] Vide page 78, ante.

[2] *List of Westchester County Tories: Historical Manuscripts*, etc.; *Miscellaneous Papers*, xxxiv., 193.

[3] Vide pages 168–171, ante.

[4] *Minutes of the Committee to Detect Conspiracies*, "Die Sabbati, 12 ho., "June 15, 1775:" *Historical Manuscripts*, etc., *Miscellaneous Papers*, xxxiv., 307, and xxx., 156.

[5] *Minutes of the Committee to Detect Conspiracies*, "Thursday, A.M., "June 27, 1776:" *Historical Manuscripts*, etc., *Miscellaneous Papers*, xxxv., 485.

[6] Frederic Philipse was a native of the Colony; and the family had been well known residents of New York for more than a century preceding the date of this letter, and was connected, by marriage, with the other leading families of America—even George Washington had not scrupled to seek an alliance with it, if tradition speaks truly.

The well-known Rev. Timothy Dwight, S. T. D., President of Yale-college, writing of Yonkers, in the Autumn of 1811, said, "it is remark-"able for nothing, except having been the residence of the family of "Philipse, one of the most distinguished of those which came, as Colonists, "from the United Netherlands. Colonel Philipse, the last branch "resident in this country, I knew well. He was a worthy and re-"spectable man, not often excelled in personal and domestic amiable-"ness. Mrs. Philipse was an excellent woman; and the children, the "eldest of whom was about seventeen, gave every promise of treading "in the same steps," (*Travels, in New England and New York*, iii., "442, 443.)

Mr. Bolton (*History of Westchester-county*, Second Edition, i., 523,) quoting from an original manuscript, in the handwriting of John Jay, said that that most zealous and most malignant of all Mr. Philipse's persecutors, said of him, probably in the later years of the life of the writer, "He was a well-tempered, amiable man; and a kind, benevolent land-"lord. He had a taste for gardening, planting, &c., and employed "much time and money in that way. * * * At the commencement "of our Revolution, he, Frederick Philipse, was inclined to the Whigs, "but was afterwards *persuaded* to favor the Tories.* He was removed "to Connecticut, on his parole. Nothing could have been more favor-"able to him, circumstanced as he then was, than to be placed in such "a state of tranquil neutrality. On a certain occasion, he obtained per-"mission to go to New York, while in possession of the enemy. On "being afterwards required to return, he very improperly and unwisely "yielded to the importunities of certain of his friends, and refused to "return. His estate was confiscated."

Sabine, notwithstanding his notorious bitterness, repeated the story of the moral worth of this unwieldy, blind man, who lived on his estate, taking no part whatever in the partisan movements of the period. (*Loyalists of the American Revolution*, original edition, 537, 538; revised edition, ii., 186, 187.)

The persecution of Frederic Philipse and the robbery of his family, mainly through the two Jays, is a subject which some one will, hereafter, be very likely to examine and expose, in all its native ugliness, to the censure of the world.

* No one knew better than John Jay that there was another cause than that named, which led Frederic Philipse to dissent from the doings of John Jay, James Duane, Governeur Morris, *et al.* Frederic Philipse continued to be a member of the Colonial party of the Opposition, in New York, until, by the advice of the Committee of which John Jay was one of the master spirits and the Chairman, he was seized by the military power and sent into exile; and the scheme and trick by means of which those exiles who had been allowed to go into New York, did *not* receive the notices which Governor Trumbull sent for their return, affording a pretext for the sequestration of their large estates, was not a secret to those who were, *then*, in the ring of "patriotic" money-seekers, nor is it a secret to us, now.

Common respect for the truth should have led John Jay to have told the whole of the story concerning Frederic Philipse's visit to New York and his stay there, or to have said nothing concerning it.

"happy to me only by the real and permanent pros-"perity of America, I should have hoped that suspi-"cions of this harsh nature would not be easily "harboured. However, as they have been thought of "weight sufficient to attract the notice of the Congress, "I can only observe that, conscious of the upright-"ness of my intentions and the integrity of my con-"duct, I would most readily comply with your Sum-"mons, but the situation of my health is such as "would render it very unadvisable for me to take a "journey to New York, at this time. I have had the "misfortune, Gentlemen, of being deprived, totally, "of the sight of my left eye; and the other is so "much affected and inflamed as to make me very "cautious how I expose it, for fear of a total loss of "sight. This being my real situation, I must request "the favour of you to excuse my attendance, to-"morrow; but you may rest assured, Gentlemen, that "I shall punctually attend, as soon as I can, con-"sistent with my health; flattering myself, in the "meantime, that, upon further consideration, you "will think that my being a friend to the rights "and interests of my native country is a fact so "strongly implied as to require no evidence on my "part to prove it, until something more substantial "than mere suspicion or vague surmises are proved "to the contrary.

"I am, Gentlemen, your most obedient, humble "servant FREDERICK PHILIPSE.

"To LEONARD GANSEVOORT, PHILIP LIVINGSTON, "THOMAS TREDWELL, LEWIS GRAHAM, GOUV-"ERNEUR MORRIS, THOMAS RANDALL, Es-"quires."[1]

As the Provincial Congress, as well as its Committee to Detect Conspiracies, had hurriedly left the City of New York before the day appointed for the hearing of Frederic Philipse and Samuel Merritt;[2] and as only one of the members of the Committee had lingered, after the Congress and the Committee had retired;[3] the proceedings against them, at that time, were evidently suspended—the suspension of the persecution of Mr. Philipse, however, was speedily followed by a similar proceeding, of which mention will be made, hereafter.

The fourth Provincial Congress was directed to meet at the Court-house, in the White Plains, on until the following day, Tuesday, the ninth of July, the Deputies from a majority of the Counties appeared, produced their Credentials, and organized the Congress. General Nathaniel Woodhull was chosen for its President; and John McKesson and Robert Benson, the Secretaries of the former Congresses, were continued in the same places, in this.[5]

There were only five Deputies present from the City of New York, although twenty-one had been elected; but every member of the Deputation from Westchester-county—Colonel Lewis Graham, Colonel Pierre Van Cortlandt, Major Ebenezer Lockwood, William Paulding, Captain Jonathan Platt, Samuel Haviland, Zebadiah Mills, Colonel Gilbert Drake, Jonathan G. Tompkins, General Lewis Morris, and Gouverneur Morris—was present.[6] Of the latter Captain Platt, Colonel Van Cortlandt, Zebadiah Mills, and General Lewis Morris were new members.[7]

After a letter from the Delegation of the Colony in the Continental Congress, bearing date the second of July, "on the subject of Independence, and request-"ing instructions from this Congress,"[8] had been read, a second letter from the Delegation, of a subsequent date, "enclosing the *Declaration of Independence*," was also read, and referred to a Committee consisting of John Jay and Abraham Brasier, of the City of New York, Abraham Yates, Junior, of Albany-county, and John Sloss Hobart and William Smith, of Suffolk.[9]

The *Declaration* which was thus referred, was a duly authenticated copy of *A Declaration by the Representatives of the United States of America, in General Congress assembled*, of which document mention has been already made; and, with its authentication, *in extenso*, it was entered at length on the *Journal of the Congress*.[10]

A very important letter, concerning prisoners of Monday, the eighth of July, 1776;[4] but it was not

---

[1] Force's *American Archives*, Fourth Series, vi., 1215, 1216.

[2] Vide pages 164-171, note.

[3] Judge Jones, who was, also, one of those whom the Committee had summoned, related the fact that, on the thirtieth of June, Governeur Morris was the only member of the Committee who had not left the City, in the general panic. *History of New York during the Revolutionary War*, ii., 296.)

In view of Governeur Morris's great anxiety to go into the City of New York, then a military post of the Royal Troops, very soon afterwards, it will hardly be necessary for us to inquire why he was the only member of the Provincial Congress who voluntarily exposed himself to supposed danger from the approach of the Royal Army.

[4] *Journal of the* (third) *Provincial Congress*, "Sunday afternoon, June "30, 1776."

[5] *Journal of the Provincial Congress*, "Tuesday, 9th July, 1776."

Very singularly, and without the slightest authority except that of J. Warren Tompkins, Bolton, (*History of Westchester-county*, original edition, ii., 359; *the same*, second edition, ii., 564,) considered the Congress which was assembled, at the White Plains, on the ninth of July, 1776, as the same body as that which had been in session, in the City of New York, from the eighteenth of May until the thirtieth of June, preceding. In other words, both these learned historians regarded the third and the fourth Provincial Congresses as one and the same body

[6] *Journal of the Provincial Congress*, "Tuesday, P.M., WHITE PLAINS, "July 9, 1776."

[7] *The Journal of the Congress*, July 9, placed Colonel Van Cortlandt's name at the head of the list of "the new members present" who "took the general oath of secrecy," although the Colonel had headed the Deputation from Westchester-county, in the third Provincial Congress, as will be seen by reference to the *Credentials* of that Delegation, in the *Journal of that Congress*, "Die Sabbati, 10 ho., A.M., May 18, "1776."

The explanation of that apparent contradiction may be found in the fact that that short lived third Provincial Congress was dissolved before Colonel Pierre Van Cortlandt took his seat in it or was qualified to do so, by his taking the oaths of the office of Deputy.

[8] *George Clinton, Henry Wisner, John Alsop, William Floyd, and Francis Lewis, to the Provincial Congress*, "PHILADELPHIA, July 2, 1776."

[9] *Journal of the Provincial Congress*, "Tuesday, 9th July, 1776."

[10] Ibid.

war and those who were, also, confined in the Jail, in the City of New York, for debt,[1] was received from General Washington, and referred to a special Committee;[2] and after the transaction of some other business, the Congress adjourned until the afternoon.

On the afternoon of the same day, [*Tuesday July* 9, 1776,] the Committee to whom had been referred the letter from the Delegation from the Colony in the Continental Congress and the *Declaration* which that letter had covered, made a Report, thereon, in the following words:

"IN CONVENTION OF THE REPRESENTA-
"TIVES OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK,[3]
"WHITE PLAINS, July 9th, 1776.

"RESOLVED, UNANIMOUSLY, That the reasons "assigned by the Continental Congress for declaring "the United Colonies free and independent States "are cogent and conclusive; and that, while we "lament the cruel necessity which has rendered that "measure unavoidable, we approve the same and "will, at the risk of our lives and fortunes, join with "the other Colonies in supporting it.

"RESOLVED, That a copy of the said *Declaration* "and the aforegoing Resolution be sent to the Chair-"man of the Committee of the County of Westches-"ter, with order to publish the same, with beat of "drum, at this place, on Thursday next," [*July* 11, 1775]; "and to give directions that it be published, "with all convenient speed, in the several Districts "within the said County; and that copies thereof be "forthwith transmitted to the other County Com-"mittees within the State of New York, with orders to "cause the same to be published in the several "Districts of their respetive Counties.

"RESOLVED, That five hundred copies of the "*Declaration of Independence*, with the two last men-"tioned Resolutions of this Congress for approving "and proclaiming the same, be published in hand-"bills and sent to all the County Committees in this "State.

"RESOLVED, That the Delegates of this State, in "Continental Congress, be and they are hereby "authorized to consent to and adopt all such mea-"sures as they may deem conducive to the happiness "and welfare of the United States of America."

It is said that the Report which was thus made by the Committee was unanimously adopted by the Congress; and, further, that an *Order* was made by the Congress directing that copies of the Resolutions which constituted the Report should be transmitted to the Continental Congress.[4]

The reader need only to be reminded that the evident author and the known supporters of this series of Resolutions were the same author who, twenty-eight days previously, had written, and almost entirely the same individual Deputies who, at the same time, had voted, that the authority of "the good "people of this Colony" was, then, necessary to enable the Provincial Congress or the Delegates of the Colony in the Continental Congress "to declare this "Colony to be and continue independent of the Crown "of Great Britain;" that, in the absence of any such authority already delegated to themselves or to the Colony's Delegates in the Continental Congress, it was, at that time, considered proper and necessary to ask for authority to do so, if it should be subsequently considered expedient and proper to make such a declaration of Independence, in behalf of that "good "people" of whom they, then, acknowledged themselves to have been only agents or deputies; that, for reasons which will be remembered, no such authority, then nor subsequently, had been delegated to either themselves or to the Colony's Delegates in the Continental Congress; by that "good people" whose servants and representatives both they and the Delegates referred to acknowledged themselves to have been; and that, on the later occasion, which is now under notice, themselves having been the witnesses, they were quite as much without authority, legal or revolutionary, "to declare this Colony to be and "continue independent of the Crown of Great "Britain," as they had been, on the former occasion, of which mention has been made. If it had been an act of usurpation to have declared the Independence of the Colony, without the "consent" of the Colony, previously given, on the former occasion, how much less flagrant was the act, also without having obtained that "consent," on the later occasion, which is now under consideration? Were John Jay and those whom

---

[1] *Joseph Reed, Adjutant-general* (by the General's order) *to the Provincial Congress*, "HEAD-QUARTERS, NEW-YORK, July 5th, 1776."

[2] *Journal of the Provincial Congress*, "Tuesday, 9th July, 1776."

[3] In view of the fact that the body of which that Committee was a part and by whom it had been appointed and to whom it was to report, was, specifically, "a Provincial Congress for the Province of New "York;" and because, at that time, there had been no change in the status of the Deputations composing the Congress, who represented nothing else than certain specified Counties, each Deputation representing only a single County; and because, at that time, the Colony of New York, could not be possibly regarded as a "State," the caption of that Report displayed nothing of historical or legal precision, nothing of accuracy of statement, and nothing of good taste.

The hand which wrote it could not be concealed; and if the form of the writing answered the present purpose of the writer of it, in certifying his new-born zeal for Independence to his astonished constituents, it would probably answer an equally good purpose in invalidating the instrument of which it was the head, in case that "Reconciliation" for which the writer of the Report did not cease to hope and to pray and to labor, should be effected.

[4] *Journal of the Provincial Congress*, "Tuesday, P.M., WHITE PLAINS, "July 9th, 1776."

The *Journal of the Continental Congress*, of Monday, the fifteenth of July, stated that a copy of the first, second, and fourth of these very important Resolutions had been enclosed, with a number of other papers, in a letter dated on the eleventh of that month, and sent to that Congress: that the letter and the papers which were enclosed in it were received by the Continental Congress, on Monday, the fifteenth of July; that the three Resolutions named were entered at length, on the *Journal of that Congress*; and that "the letter, with the papers enclosed," was referred to the Board of War.

be controlled really honest and sincere, when, on the eleventh of June, preceding, they made the confession of their legal incapacity to make such a declaration of Independence, unless with the previously-obtained "consent" of that "good people" whose servants and deputies they then acknowledged themselves to have been? If so, what possible ground is there for consistently regarding them as either honest or sincere, when, on the ninth of July, the occasion which is now under notice, while they were yet without that "consent" of their principals and constituents which had been previously regarded as essential to ensure validity to any such action, they actually, on their own motion, made such a declaration: severed the political connection which had previously existed between the Colony and Great Britain; abrogated all the Laws under which the Colony had been previously governed; deposed the previously existing Colonial Government; and usurped, to themselves, without the slightest limitation, the absolute and despotic control of every thing relating to the Civil, the Ecclesiastical, and the Military concerns of all who were within the Colony, not sparing even the consciences, the opinions, the properties, the liberties, or the lives of those who presumed to say to them, "What doest thou?"

We shall see, hereafter, how much of honesty and integrity there were, in either of these, when the series of Resolutions, on the subject of the Colony's independence, which is now under consideration, was written and adopted; how little the writer of them honestly and sincerely regarded those Resolutions as being, really, what they appeared to have been; and how little foundation in truth there is for the greater portion of what has been written concerning that writer and what he did, on the ninth of July, 1776.

Having disposed of the subject of Independence in the curt and crispy *Resolution* which headed the series which was reported by the Committee, the Provincial Congress turned to other subjects of vastly less importance; and, two days afterwards, on Thursday, the eleventh of July, very probably, no record of the fact having been found, the publication of the *Declaration* was made, officially, at the White Plains, in conformity with the second Resolution of the series, on that subject, which had been adopted by the Congress.[1]

The great importance of that Resolution which gave the sanction of the Colony of New York to the *Resolution for Independence* which the Congress of the Continent had adopted on the second of July, was seen in the immediate abrogation of all the forms of Law and Government which had previously been seen throughout the Colony, from the earlier period of the settlement by Europeans within its territory; and the substitution, in their stead, of nothing else than the government of unrestrained force, the Law of the stronger. A general Jail-delivery, in the City of New York, signalized the "new departure"—where there was no longer any Law, there could not be any breaches of the Law, either in the matter of pecuniary obligations or in that of any other obligation—and as every civil Commission was cancelled by that *Resolution of Independence* from the Crown of Great Britain, on the authority of which royal authority every such Commission was based, every Court of Justice was closed, every function of Government was paralyzed, and because no new form of local Government and no new system of Statutes had been provided to take the places of the others, which had been thus violently set aside, there was nothing but confusion and uncertainty; and had not the general conservatism of the Colonists prevailed and preserved the general peace, the advent of Independence, throughout the Colony of New York, would have been signalized by many a local scene of terrorism and of bloodshed. It was not so in the other Colonies; and had not the master-spirits of the revolutionary faction, in New York, in the interest of Reconciliation, obstructed the work of creating a new form of Government, quite as effectively as, at the same time, they were creating a necessity for such a new system—at least for a Provisional Government, if not for a permanent one—New York might, also, have been fully prepared for the great changes, in all her governmental arrangements, which were thus crowded on her. A very competent writer, a witness of the great changes of which he wrote and of which we write, thus accurately and graphically described them: "*The Declaration of Independence*, published by Congress on "the fourth of July, 1776, was the first act that put "an end to the Courts of Law, to the Laws of the "land, and to the administration of Justice, under "the British Crown, within the thirteen Colonies. "The revolt was now complete. Upon this event, "the Law, the Courts, and Justice itself ceased: all "was anarchy: all was confusion. A usurped kind "of Government took place: a medley of Military "Law, Convention Ordinances, Congress Recommendations, and Committee Resolutions."[2]

It is proper that we shall say, however, that, notwithstanding the *Declaration of Independence* was thus nominally accepted and approved, and notwithstanding New York was thus formally obligated to stand or fall with her sister States in the support and defense of the cause in which they were engaged, Independence had not been, as we have already seen, what the revolutionary faction of the great party of

[1] Bolton stated, in his *History of Westchester-county*, (original edition, ii., 359, 360; *the same*, second edition, ii., 564,) that, on the occasion referred to, "the *Declaration* was read by John Thomas, Esq., and "seconded by Michael Varian and Samuel Crawford, two prominent "Whigs of Scarsdale." But he has given no authority for the statement; and unless by "John Thomas, Esq.," the reader of the *Declaration* on the occasion referred to, he meant the younger of the two who bore that name, we must be excused for doubting the accuracy of the statement.

[2] Jones's *History of New York during the Revolutionary War*, ii., 115.

the Opposition, in New York, had desired and aimed for; nor, since it had been crowded through the Continental Congress without the approval of the master-spirits of that revolutionary faction of the party and in the face of the determined opposition of those who represented or who, in other Colonies, were affiliated with that faction, although the *Declaration* and Independence itself had been acquiesced in by the Provincial Congress, did the same faction regard either with the slightest favor; nor, as the subsequent conduct of its leading members, those of its number from whom the character and disposition of the whole may be fairly estimated, in postponing the establishment of a new form of Government for the young State and leaving it during more than nine months without the slightest semblance of a Government of any kind, clearly indicated, did that remarkable faction, then, intend to respect either the *Resolution for Independence* or the *Declaration* of it any longer than would be necessary to enable it to effect a reconciliation with Great Britain, and, thereby, to secure to that family of whom all the faction were either members or hungry followers, all those official places, within the Colony, which were then occupied by their hereditary rivals, and all that influence, for like purposes of aggrandizement, within other Colonies and within the Congress of the confederacy, to which that horde of miscellaneous office-seekers desperately aspired, and to which, it was fondly considered, it would become reasonably entitled.

On the afternoon of the ninth of July, immediately after the Provincial Congress had adopted the Report of the Committee to whom the *Declaration of Independence* had been referred, and, thereby, as far as it could do so, had abrogated every Law and every Commission which had rested on the sovereignty of the King of Great Britain, with singular coolness but entirely consistent with the absolutism which had thus been inaugurated and with the disposition and desires of those who then controlled the Congress, the Sheriffs of the several Counties were "authorized "and directed" [*not by Law, but only by the oligarchic will and the consequent* ipse dixit *of the Congress,*] "to "retain and keep in their custody all prisoners, of "whatever kind, which are or may be in their custody, until the further order of this Convention, "or until such of them as may be confined for "debt, on civil process, shall be released by the "Plaintiffs so brought against them;"[1] and thus provision was made for the safekeeping not only of the victims of earlier lawlessness but of subsequent absolutism, the latter, by the terms of the Resolution, concentrated within the Provincial Congress itself.[2]

Immediately after the provision of depositaries for the victims of its absolutism, as stated in the Resolution above referred to, the Provincial Congress revived the notorious Committee to detect Conspiracies, which had ceased to exist by reason of the dissolution of the Congress who had created it;[3] united it to the Committee on Prisoners of War, which had been appointed during the morning session; withdrew the authority to interfere with those who were suspected of disaffection, which had been vested in General Washington, by the preceding Provincial Congress, during the panic occasioned by the arrival of the Royal Army;[4] vested the consolidated Committee, thus created, with authority to "carry into execution "all such Resolves of the Continental Congress and "comply with all such necessary requisitions of the "General" [*Washington,*] "as require so much de-"spatch as to render an application to this Congress "impracticable or attended with dangerous delay;" appointed John Sloss Hobart, of Suffolk, Gouverneur Morris and Colonel Lewis Graham, of Westchester-county, Leonard Gansevoort, of Albany-county, and Thomas Randall and Colonel Henry Remsen, of the City of New York, or any three of them, for such Committee; "permitted" the Committee "to proceed "in the business under" [*unto?*] "them committed, "in such a manner as to them shall appear to be most "agreeable to the dictates of justice and humanity "and most advancive of the public good:"[5] and so set in motion, again, that concealed instrumentality of despotism, which, under the same plea of "necessity," had stamped the records and the history of the third Provincial Congress with everlasting shame; and, in this later instance, with such an increase of authority as made it, practically, an absolute power which was greater in its ability to oppress the State than even the Provincial Congress itself.[6]

---

[1] *Journal of the Provincial Congress,* "Tuesday, P.M., WHITE PLAINS, "July 9th, 1776."

[2] It is very evident that James De Lancey, the Sheriff of Westchester-county, or the Deputy who represented him, obeyed the Resolution of the Provincial Congress by holding in confinement, in the County Jail, those "Prisoners of State" who, for political reasons, had been or who were, subsequently, sent to him, (*Petition of Joshua Purdy and fourteen others,* "WHITE PLAINS GOAL, August the 18th, 1776;" *Petition of Jonathan Purdy, Junior,* "WHITE PLAINS GOAL, August 30th, 1776;" *Petition of Henry Chase,* "WHITE PLAINS GOAL, August 30, 1776;" etc.) as well as those Prisoners of War who, also, were sent to him, for safe-keeping, (*Examinations of John Sampson, James Auchmuty, and seven others, Prisoners of War,* "WHITE PLAINS IN WESTCHESTER COUNTY, July 6th, 1776, compared with the *Petition of William McDermod,* one of the number; with the *Bonds of James Auchmuty and John Sampson and William McDermod* dated October 29, 1776; and with the *Petition of John Sampson, William McDermod, William Ebbe, and Joseph Wolleweb,* "Octr., 1776;") the latter of which Petitions is also interesting because of the information which it brings of the treatment of Prisoners of War, at the White Plains, by those who were in authority, under the "Convention of the Representa-"tives of the State of New York;" etc.

[3] Vide page 171, ante.

[4] *Journal of the Provincial Congress,* "Sunday Afternoon, June 30th, 1776."

[5] *Journal of the Provincial Congress,* "Tuesday, P.M., White Plains, "July 9th, 1776."

[6] Although the Provincial Congress was seated at a distance from the City of New York, this Committee preferred to hold its meetings in that City; and, with the unlimited authority with which it was vested, with nothing to control its own estimate of a "necessity," and with the strong arm of the military power to support that estimate, that Committee was, in fact, an oligarchy of absolute power, possessing greater means for oppression and outrage than was held by the Provincial Congress which had created it and by whose warrant it acted.

On Wednesday, the tenth of July, the Provincial Congress "resolved and ordered that the style or title of this House be changed from 'THE PROVINCIAL CONGRESS OF THE COLONY OF NEW-YORK', "which it had previously borne, to that of 'THE "'CONVENTION OF THE REPRESENTATIVES OF THE "'STATE OF NEW-YORK;'"[1] and, thenceforth, there was no open pretension that the King of Great Britain was the Sovereign of that portion of America or that those who were within the bounds of her territory owed the slightest allegiance to him or obedience to his commands.

The fourth Provincial Congress, notwithstanding the momentous events which were evidently rapidly approaching, was immediately zealous in continuing the remarkable policy which had distinguished the preceding three of the series and which had served to keep alive and to intensify the feuds of former days, separating the Colonists into factions, bitterly antagonistic in feelings and in actions, instead of seeking to conciliate those who differed; to pacify those who were discontented; to bring into harmony, the thoughts and opinions and desires which were discordant and jarring; and to secure concert of action, for the promotion and support of "the common cause," among those who had previously differed only on the means which should be employed for the accomplishment of the common purpose. But the revival, with largely increased authority and without any diminution of malignancy, of the notorious political Inquisition—the Committee to detect Conspiracies—afforded abundant evidence of the purpose of the master-spirits of the new-formed Convention to keep apart those who might have been united, had a redress of grievances been the only purpose of the movements; and to drive over into the ranks of the Royal Army or into the service of that Army, those who, under a more judicious policy, would not have become enemies, eager for retaliation, even if they had not become very active friends. The outlawry of Richmond and Queens-counties and the terrible outrages which had been inflicted on their peaceful inhabitants, under the authority or with the permission of the earlier Provincial Congresses, had already produced their legitimate results, in the eagerness with which the persecuted and outraged inhabitants of each of these Counties had accepted the protection of the Royal Army and taken up arms for retaliatory action;[2] and nothing else than a continued and a more than ever before besotted haughtiness, utterly unmindful of the Rights of those who were assumed to be subject to their authority, and a continued and more than ever before mulish stubbornness, in their continued determination to reduce every one who opposed them, no matter how slightly, to an unconditional and absolute submission of thought, word, and deed, to their oligarchic authority, regardless of any and every consequence to others or to the country at large—only such a haughtiness and such a stubbornness, indeed, as had characterized the Colonial policy and the administration of Lord Bute and Lord North and Lord George Germaine and their Tory associates, in England; the same as those which had controlled the three Congresses which had preceded it, after the members of the first of them had been induced to wander into the green pastures of the revolutionary faction—could have induced the master-spirits of this new Provincial Congress, under the peculiar circumstances which had recently arisen, to disregard the significant teachings of their earlier policy, and to create disaffection and to raise up enemies when harmony and a concert of action, in the cause of their common country, had become so vitally necessary. In the prosecution of that ill-advised and injudicious, as well as barbarous, policy, it continued to make arrests of individuals whom somebody had denounced as "suspected;[3] and even individual members of the Convention, on their individual motions, without the slightest charge against their victims, ordered individuals into imprisonment.[4]

---

[1] *Journal of the Provincial Congress*, "Wednesday morning, WHITE "PLAINS, July 10th, 1776."

Doctor Sparks erroneously stated, (*Writings of George Washington*, iii., 470, note,) that that change in the title of the Provincial Congress was made on the *ninth* of July, and cited the Manuscript *Journal of the Congress*, of the *ninth* of July, as his authority: we have preferred to depend on the official copy of that *Journal*, as it was printed by order of the Legislature, in 1842, which clearly indicates that the change was made on the following day.

[2] John Adams was either a very poor judge of human nature or a very besotted and haughty aristocrat, regarding the masses as unworthy of his sympathy or respect, or both, when he wrote of these people, then bleeding from every pore, from outrages inflicted on them by authority or with the permission of the Provincial Congress, and rejoicing that protection had been extended to them and to their property, by strangers, in such words as these: "The unprincipled and unfeeling and un-"natural inhabitants of Staten-Island are cordially receiving the enemy; "and, deserters say, have engaged to take arms. They are an ignorant, "cowardly pack of scoundrels. Their numbers are small, and their "spirit less." (*Letter to Mrs. Adams*, "PHILADELPHIA, July 11, 1776.")

Mr. Adams should have told just what he would have done, had he and his family passed through such an ordeal of "patriotism" as these islanders had sustained, and had he, as they were, been without hope of relief from his own countrymen. The record of his judgment would, then, have been complete.

[3] See the instances of Christopher Templer, (*Journal of the Convention*, "Die Lunæ, 4 ho., P.M., July 22, 1776;") that of Robert Sutton, (*The same*, "Die Mercurii, 9 ho., A.M., July 24th, 1776;") that of Nicholas Couwenhoven, (*Journal of the Committee of Safety*, "Tuesday afternoon "Aug. 27, 1776;") and many others.

[4] See the instance of Henry Chase, "committed to the Jail at White "Plains, by an order from the Major,' [*Major Webster, Deputy from Charlotte-county.*] (*Journal of the Convention*, "Die Jovis, 5 ho., P.M., "July 25, 1776.")

This case of imprisonment of Henry Chase very perfectly illustrated the despotic disposition and actions of those who were then in authority.

On the twenty-fifth of July, the date of the entry of his arrest on the *Journal of the Convention*, (he may have been arrested much earlier,) he petitioned the Convention that he was "confined in Gaol upon suspicion, "without money or friends," and begged that body would "bestow its "charity" upon him, (*Petition of Henry Chase and three others*, "WHITE "PLAINS, July 25, 1776:" *Historical Manuscripts*, etc.: *Petitions*, xxxiii., 152.)

On the thirtieth of August, Chase again petitioned the Convention, as follows:

Arrests were thus made, very often, without the slightest reason, even from the standpoint of those exercising the authority;[1] and even women, when they refused to be made tools for their inquisitorial practices, were ordered to be imprisoned "until they "should make discovery or declaration aforesaid."[2] Arrests were made by military officers, even for alleged civil offences;[3] and, of course, the arbitrary arrests of those who were obnoxious to members of the several County Committees were continued, without abatement[4]—the Committee of the City of New York assumed authority to pass over the Hudson-river, into New Jersey; to arrest six persons, "in "Bergen Woods, near Bull's Ferry;" and to bring its prisoners over the river, and imprison them in the Jail of the City.[5] Occasionally, food was provided for those who were thus seized and confined;[6] but such a favor was exceptional: in some instances, the expense of being confined was increased by official extras;[7] but there was an instance, also, wherein a prisoner, arrested by order of the Commander-in-Chief, was liberated from confinement, by the Convention, and given the largest liberty, with no other condition than that of an elastic parole, only because of his "connection with a large family of well-attached, "warm Whigs," and because it would be "the most "politic course to do so;"[8] and a second instance, wherein "a person of equivocal character," in Westchester-county,[9] and whose name was included in the *List of Suspected Persons* on which Frederic Philipse's name also appeared,[10] and who was ostentatiously summoned to appear before the notorious "Committee to "detect Conspiracies," of which his half-brother and

"WIGHT PLAINS GOAL, August 30, 1776.

"GENTLEMEN: My confinement is the Reason of my Petitioning to "you the Honorable Provential Congress, hoping your Honours will be "Pleas[d] to Take my Case into Consideration for the Comete of Safety" [*the Committee of Westchester county*] "Says that they have no Right to "try me So I leave my Case to your Honnours and Begg that your "Honnours would Concider me for I have bin imprisoned a long time, "and nothing Appeared against me, So I begg that your Honnours "would consider me as Quick as Possible for I am a Poor man and itt is "a Great Dammage to me to Ly in Prison, so Gentlemen I Leave my "Case to your Honnours not Douting but your wisdoms Gentlemen will "do me jestice, the Broken Petition from me,

"HENRY CHASE.

"POSTSCRIPT. GENTLEMEN I should be very glad if your Honnours "would be so good as to send for me before your Honnour as Quick as "Possible and in so doing you will greatly me.

"HENRY CHASE."

(*Historical Manuscripts*, etc.: *Petitions*: XXXIII., 100.)

The County Committee had officially informed Chase, nine days previously, that it had no jurisdiction of his case, and directed him to the Convention, (*Westchester-county Committee to Henry Chase*, "IN COMMITTEE OF SAFETY FOR THE COUNTY OF WESTCHESTER, WHITE PLAINS, "Aug. 21, 1776"—*Historical Manuscripts*, etc.: *Petitions*, XXXIII, 102;) but no attention whatever was paid to the poor man's Petition, by either the Committee of Safety of the State or the Convention to whom it was addressed—he was only "a Poor man," one of the "poor rep-"tiles," of earlier "patriotism."

On the thirteenth of September, the unfortunate prisoner again presented a Petition for relief, in these words:

"WHITE PLAINS GOAL, September 13, 1776.

"GENTLEMEN OF THE HONORABLE PROVENSHALL CONGRESS.

"This my Humble Petition to Beg of your Honnours to send for me "that I may have my tryal for the County Commete and the Commete "of Safety says that they have no Right to try me and I have desird "them to send me to the Honnonrable Provenshall Congress and they "tell me they Dare Not send me without orders from your Honnours "Gentlemen so I shall be very Glad if your Honnours will be Good "Enouf to send for me as soon as Possible, for I have bin in Prison "Going on Eight weeks and I cant support myself any Longer,[8] So "Gentlemen I Shall be very Glad if your Honnours would take my "case into Consideration if your Honnours Pleases so that I may be "clear[d] or condem[d] So Gentlemen I leave my case to your Honnours "wise consideration not Douting but your Honnours will have compas-"sion on a Poor Prisoner.

"HENRY CHASE."

(*Historical Manuscripts*, etc.: *Petitions*, XXXIII., 90.)

To this second appeal, there does not appear to have been made the slightest answer, although it was received by the Convention, and "read," (*Journal of the Convention*, Tuesday morning, Septr. 17, 1776;) and History is silent concerning the remainder of the victim's career.

Those who shall desire to know who and what kind of a man it was who had thus possessed and exercised power enough to point his dirty finger at a man and cause him to be thus outrag[ed], without any remedy, may be gratified by turning to a *Petition* addressed to the Provincial Congress, on the fourth of May, 1776, by William Duer, subsequently well known, (*Historical Manuscripts*, etc.; *Petitions*, XXXII., 85;) and to the *Acco[t] of Monies, p[d] by the Treasurer for which no Acco[t] has been rendered by the persons to whom they were paid*, reported by the Treasurer to the Convention, on the eighteenth of September, 1776.

(*Historical Manuscripts*, etc.; *Miscellaneous Papers*, XXXVI., 257.)

[1] The instances of Christopher Templar, already referred to; that of Robert Sutton, (*Journal of the Convention*, "Die Mercurii, 9 ho., A.M., "July 24, 1776;") that of John Thomas, (*the same*, "Die Sabbati, 9 ho., "A.M., July 27, 1776;" that of John Sutton, (*the same*, "Die Sabbati, 3 "ho., P.M., July 27, 1776;") and others.

[2] See the instance of Elizabeth Hicks, of Rockaway, (*Journal of the Convention*, "Die Mercurii, 9 ho., A.M., August 14, 1776.")

[3] See the instances of George Davy and William Tucker, arrested by Major Graham, (*Journal of the Convention*, "Thursday morning, July "18, 1776;") those arrested by Lieutenant Brett, (*the same*, "Die Veneris, "4 ho., P.M., Septr. 27, 1776;") etc.

[4] The instances of William Sutton and his son, John Sutton, (the latter discharged by the Convention,) arrested by the Committee of Westchester-county, (*Journal of the Convention*, "Die Jovis, 5 ho., P.M. July 25, "1776,") and of Abraham C. Cuyler, John Duncan, Stephen De Lancey, John Monier, and Benjamin Hilton, arrested and banished into Connecticut, by the Committee of Albany-county, (*the same*, "Die Mercurii, 9 "ho., A.M., Augt. 21, 1776,") are noteworthy.

[5] *John Berrian, Chairman, to the Convention*, "COMMITTEE CHAMBER, "NEW-YORK, Augt. 2, 1776;" *Journal of the Convention*, "Die Mer-"curii, 9 ho., A.M., Augt. 7, 1776."

[6] The instances of Binler Van Housen and Henry Dawkins, in the Jail at the White Plains, (*Journal of the Convention*, "Friday morning, "August 9, 1776,") may be noticed.

[7] William Sutton was arrested and confined in the Jail at the Plains, furnishing his own food, as was usual; but, soon after, he was banished to Philadelphia, and there confined, "subsisting himself," besides having been required to pay to Lieutenant Alexander Hunt, who conveyed him to Philadelphia, the expenses of his own journey, the expenses of Hunt while thus engaged in escorting him, and twelve shillings per day to the latter, "for his trouble in the premises." (*Journal of the Convention*, "Die Sabbati, 3 ho., P.M., July 27, 1776.")

[8] See the instance of Willett Taylor, who was thus favored, at the instance of General John Morin Scott, (*Journal of the Convention*, "Tues-"day morning, Augt. 13, 1776;" *the same*, "Thursday, A.M., August "15, 1776;" *General John Morin Scott to John McKesson*, "NEW-YORK, "*horâ resp.* 13th August, 1776;" *the same* to —— ——, "NEW-YORK, "Aug. 13, 1776.")

[9] *Minutes of the Committee to detect Conspiracies*, "Thursday, A.M., "June 27, 1776."

[10] *Historical Manuscripts*, etc.: *Miscellaneous Papers*, XXXVI., 156.

[8] The reader will remember that such prisoners as this, those thrust into confinement because it suited somebody to "suspect" them, were compelled to support themselves, while in Jail, or to starve, unless somebody should charitably help them to food.

another kinsman were leading members,[1] was made the "Judge of the High Court of Admiralty of this "State," only thirty-four days after he had been thus summoned to answer a charge of having been "suspected," and before he had answered to that Summons;[2] and a third instance, when a leading member of the Convention itself, because of his known inclinations and because of his continued and frequent correspondence with his friends, in the City of New York as well as with those in Philadelphia, after both those Cities had been occupied by the Royal Army; and because of his expressed desire to go into the City of New York, for the purpose of visiting those friends; and because of his application for a flag, for the purpose of carrying those desires into effect; became generally and very seriously "suspected,"[3] without having been officially disturbed, by any one—he was not one of those "poor vipers" of whom he had told, only a few months previously;[4] nor did he come within the circle of those whom the dominant, aristocratic clique of that period was inclined to degrade to the level of the common people. There have been some, from that time until this, who have seen that, in the hands of such as then controlled the affairs of New York, the scales of justice were sadly tilted; that there was one kind of justice for one class of the inhabitants and another kind of justice for another class; that, in practice, the vaunted equality of all men was a fiction.

It was a favorite practice to remove the victims of these arrests from the vicinage of the alleged offence; and the Jail at Kingston was much employed,[5] although Morristown, in New Jersey,[6] and Hartford, in Connecticut,[7] and the City of Philadelphia,[8] and "others "of the neighbouring States,"[9]—of course, the older-time repository of the victims of New York's "suspicion," at Litchfield, in Connecticut, was included;[10]—did not fail to receive their very welcome supply of well-to-do boarders.

During the first three months of the existence of the Convention, there were thus lawlessly seized, of the residents of Westchester-county, William and John Sutton, of Mamaroneck;[11] John Rogers, a servant of Lewis Morris, of Morrisania;[12] Joseph Reade, of Westchester;[13] Isaac Underhill, of Yonkers,[14] and Philip Palmer[15] and James Horton, Junior,[16] besides a number of others the names of whom were not recorded on the *Journal of the Convention*.[17]

---

[1] *Minutes of the Committee to detect Conspiracies*, "Thursday, A.M., "June 27, 1776."

[2] Compare the record of the *Summons* of Richard Morris, in the preceding Note, with that of his appointment, in the *Journal of the Convention*, "Die Mercurii, 9 ho., A.M., July 31, 1776."

[3] Reference is made, in this place, to Gouverneur Morris; and those who shall incline to know more of the subjects referred to, are referred to Doctor Sparks's *Life of Gouverneur Morris*, i., 154–161, in which, notwithstanding the evident purpose of the kind-hearted biographer to say as little in disparagement of the aristocratic culprit as possible, the careful reader will perceive the unceasing hankerings of that distinguished "patriot," for the fleshpots of monarchy.

[4] Vide page 12, ante.

[5] The instances of Bloomer Nelson, Samuel Haines, Josiah Disberry, and Jacob Schureman, residents of Westchester-county, (*Journal of the Convention*, "Thursday morning, August 29, 1776;" *Petition of John Sare, Bloomer Nelson, and others*, "KINGSTON GOAL, Febry 19th, 1777"—*Historical Manuscripts: Petitions*, xxxiii., 638; *Petition of Bloomer Nelson and three others*, "KINGSTON GOAL, March 26, 1777—*Historical Manuscripts*, etc.,: *Petitions*, xxxiii., 610.) are sufficient for this purpose, although there are numerous others.

[6] *Journal of the Convention*, "Die Sabbati, 9 ho., A.M., Augt. 17, 1776;" *the President of the Convention to the Committee of Ulster-county*, "IN CONVENTION OF THE REPRESENTATIVES OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK, "HARLEM, Augt. 17, 1776;" etc.

[7] The instances of Abraham C. Cuyler, John Duncan, Stephen De Lancey, John Monier, and Benjamin Hilton, already referred to, will be remembered by the reader.

[8] It will be remembered that William Sutton of Mamaroneck was banished to Philadelphia.

[9] *Journal of the Committee of Safety*, "Saturday morning, Novr. 9, "1776."

[10] *Journal of the Convention*, "Die Jovis, 4 ho., P.M., July 18, 1776."

[11] Vide page 200, ante.

[12] *Journal of the Convention*, "Wednesday morning, Augt. 28, 1776;" *the same*, "Thursday morning, Augt. 29, 1776."

[13] The Affidavit on which Joseph Reade was ordered to be arrested is such a singular production that we are induced to copy it.

"DUTCHESS COUNTY, ss. Abraham W. D. Peyster, being sworn, depos-"eth and saith: that, on Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday, the fourth, "fifth, and sixth days of September instant, he was at New-Rochelle, in "the County of Westchester; that on one of the above-named days, he "heard, (as far as he can at present recollect,) either Theodosius Bartow, "of New-Rochelle aforesaid, or Anthony Abrahams, of the Town of "Westchester, in substance, say, in a conversation this Deponent had "with the one or the other of them, on the American contest, that Jo-"seph Reade, late of the City of New-York, Attorney-at-Law, but, at "present, as this Deponent understood, a resident in the Town of West-"chester, was reputed a great Tory; that the chief of his, the said Jo-"seph Reade's, conversation was of the Tory kind: and that he, the "said Joseph Reade, had reported that, in the late Battle on Long Is-"land, between the American Army and that of the King of Great "Britain, the Americans had lost either seven or fourteen thousand men. "(This Deponent cannot now recollect which of the two numbers was "mentioned, but rather thinks fourteen.) This Deponent further says, "that the amount of all he heard at New-Rochelle, at the time afore-"said, respecting Joseph Reade, was, that the said Joseph Reade was a "great Tory and very unfriendly to the American cause, and further "this Deponent saith not.

"A. W. D. PEYSTER.

"Sworn before me, this 10th Sept., 1776. }

"ABM. YATES, JUNR., *President*."

That Abraham W. De Peyster was an *employe* of the Convention, in its work of making arrests and conveying the victims into exile, as a copyist, etc.; and he was evidently anxious for another job, of the same class, when he volunteered this singular testimony. But the Committee of Safety disappointed his evident expectations, by transmitting the Affidavit to the Committee of Westchester-county, "with a letter requesting "them to proceed thereon," (*Journal of the Committee of Safety*, "Die "Martis, 8 ho., A.M., Septr. 10, 1776.")

[14] *Journal of the Committee of Safety*, "Die Lunæ, 9 ho., A.M., October "7, 1776."

[15] Ibid.

[16] *Journal of the Convention*, "Wednesday afternoon, July 17, 1776."

[17] "RESOLVED: That General Morris be ordered immediately to appre-"hend and secure the persons ordered to be apprehended by this Con-"vention, yesterday, and that he be furnished with a list of those persons "names," (*Journal of the Convention*, "Die Sabbati, 4 ho., P.M., Augt. "10, 1776.")

As no such Order for the arrest of any one as is recited in the above Resolution appears in the published *Journal of the Convention* of the preceding day, it is evident that this is one of those instances of arbitrary lawlessness, familiar to despots, of which the records are buried in secrecy.

Those who were supposed to have been "disaf-"fected," whether they were really so or not, very much alarmed the Convention; and the reports of the ill disposition of large portions of the inhabitants, in various parts of the State, were really and reasonably sufficient to create alarm, even among more resolute men than those of whom the Convention was constituted. Those whom the Committees and the Congresses had persecuted and outraged and all whom their sufferings could influence, very naturally and very reasonably, were "disaffected," as the inhabitants of Staten-Island had been: many, great numbers, of those who had honestly and earnestly opposed the Home Government and who had boldly demanded a redress of the Colonial grievances, were also "disaffected," when the fire-eaters' *Resolution of Independence* was forced on them, *nolens volens*, as Colonel James Holmes, of Bedford,—who had represented Westchester-county in the Provincial Convention which had sent the Delegation of the Colony to the second Continental Congress; who had represented the County in the First Provincial Congress; and who had commanded, throughout the entire Campaign of 1775, the Regiment of Troops in which were the Companies from the same County—was "disaffected," thereby. The greater number of those who had held places of honor and emolument, in the Colonial Government, notwithstanding it was politic to keep quiet, was also, more or less "disaf-"fected;" and the multitude, whose timidity would not permit them to entertain a thought that Independence would be worth what it would evidently cost to secure it, was not very loud-toned in its favor, even if it did not, very often, lean toward "disaffection." Lastly, the inhabitants of the State, very generally, anxious only to attend to their business and their farms, without the distress and misery which a Civil War would necessarily produce, and seeing no advantage to themselves or to their families by the violent overthrow of one Government and the equally violent establishment of another Government—the great majority, by far the greater number, if not the almost entire body, of the farmers of Westchester-county, was of that class—preferred to remain as they had been, before they had been outraged by the new regime; and, therefore, were classed as "disaffected." There was reason, therefore, for the more tender anxiety of the Convention, composed of those who were cowards by instinct, since "its chickens had "come home, to roost;" and, as we shall see, its anxiety was not relieved by what it was subsequently required to experience. Governor Tryon was enlisting as many as he could entice into the service of the King, both in New York and in other States;[1] and those who were "disaffected," in Westchester-county and elsewhere, were beginning to organize and to arm, for their own defence and, now and then, in support of the Royal cause.[2] The Troop of Horse, in Westchester-county, of whom mention has been made, when a quota of its members was ordered for the reinforcement of the Continental Army, at New York, early in July, 1776, had refused to comply with the Order;[3] the Regiment of Westchester Militia, commanded by Colonel Joseph Drake, of New Rochelle, also declined to be submitted to a Draft, for the same purpose, later in July;[4] it knew that very few of the Militia of that County could be expected to enter the service, even for the protection of the County itself;[5] and, on the earnest appeal of the friends of the Convention, in Salem and on Cortlandt's Manor, for the protection of the small revolutionary factions, there, from the greater number of those who were regarded as "disaffected, in those "portions of the County,"[6] a special Company of thirty men, to be commanded by Captain Samuel Delavan, and in addition to the similar Company commanded by Captain Micah Townsend, previously organized,[7] was necessarily ordered to be enlisted and established, at the expense of the State, for that particular service.[8] Even the authority of the Convention and that of the Committee of Safety of the State were disregarded by Captain Varian, of Westchester-county;[9] and there

[1] *The Convention to the Continental Congress*, "IN CONVENTION OF THE "REPRESENTATIVES, etc., WHITE-PLAINS, WESTCHESTER-COUNTY, July "11, 1776;" *the Journal of the Convention*, "Friday morning, Augt. "9, 1776;" *Report of Committee on a more effectual mode of detecting and defeating the designs of the internal enemies of this State—Journal of the Convention*, "Die Sabbati, 4 ho., P.M., Sept. 21, 1776;" and many others.

The instance of William Lounsberry, who refused to surrender and was killed, while four of his recruits—Bloomer Nelson, Jacob Schureman, Samuel Haines, and Joseph Turner—were captured, is noteworthy. Both Lounsberry and his fourteen recruits were Westchester-county Loyalists; and he and they were intercepted in Westchester-county, by a party of Westchester-county Militia, on the twenty-ninth of August, 1776. (*Journal of the Convention*, "Thursday morning, Augt. 29, 1776;" *Committee of Safety to General Washington*, "IN COMMITTEE OF SAFETY, "HARLEM, Augt. 30, 1776.")

[2] *The Committee of Safety to General Washington*, "FISHKILL, 10 Oc-"tober, 1776."

A Corps of Westchester county Refugees was subsequently raised, the Lieutenant-colonelcy of which was taken by the veteran, James Holmes, of Bedford, already mentioned, (*A Short Account of the Descent and Life of James Holmes, Esq.*, edit. 1815, reprinted, *in extenso*, in de Lancey's *Notes* to Jones's *History of New York during the Revolutionary War*, ii., 621.) Two Battalions of Loyalists were raised in Queens-county; and in several of the other Counties, heavy enlistments were also made.

[3] *Journal of the Convention*, "Thursday afternoon, July 11, 1776;" *the same*, "Die Veneris, 9 ho., A.M., July 26, 1776."

[4] *Colonel Joseph Drake to General Lewis Morris*, "NEW-ROCHEL, "July 24, 1776;" *Journal of the Convention*, "Die Mercurii, 9 ho., A.M., "July 31, 1776;" *Colonel Joseph Drake to the President of the Convention*, "NEW-ROCHELLE, 6th August, 1776;" *Journal of the Convention*, "Die Lunæ, 9 ho., A.M., Augt. 5, 1776."

[5] *Information from General George Clinton to the Convention—Journal of the Convention*, "Tuesday morning, Augt. 13, 1776."

[6] *Thaddeus Crane to Major Joseph Benedict*, "SALEM, September 7, "1776;" *Major Joseph Benedict to Colonel Gilbert Drake*, "CORLANDT "MANOR, 18 September, 1776;" *Journal of the Convention*, "Die Sab-"bati, 9 ho., A.M., Septr. 21, 1776."

[7] Vide pages 172-174, ante.

[8] *Journal of the Convention*, "Die Sabbati, 9 ho., A.M., Septr. 21, 1776."

[9] Compare *Journal of the Committee of Safety*, "KINGS BRIDGE, Augt. "30, 1776," with the *Journal of the Convention*, "Monday morning, Sep-"tember 30, 1776."

was good reason for supposing, it was said, that a correspondence was kept up between the Royal Army, on Long Island, and prominent inhabitants of that County, as far in the interior as the White Plains, as early as the close of August, in 1776.[1] The inhabitants of Kings-county were said, early in August, to "have determined not to oppose the enemy;" and a Committee was appointed, with considerable ostentation, to go to that County, and to "inquire concerning the authenticity of such report; and, in case "they find it well-founded, that they be empowered "to disarm and secure the disaffected inhabitants; to "remove or destroy the stock of Grain; and, if they "shall judge it necessary, *to lay the whole County "waste;* and, for the execution of these purposes, "they be directed to apply to General Greene, or the "Commander of the Continental Troops in that "County, for such assistance as they shall want;"[2] as if such a rash purpose would have been permitted to be carried into effect, under such peculiar circumstances, while the entire military and naval power of the King, in that part of the Continent, was resting within a mile of the proscribed County, and eager for a fight. Duchess-county, also, asked for further protection from the aggressions of the "disaffected," as Westchester-county had done;[3] and, notwithstanding two Companies had been already raised for that purpose and were then in service,[4] a third Company was ordered to be added to the local force.[5] Like the Militia of Westchester-county, that of Duchess-county was exceedingly "disaffected," and would not be drafted;[6] and with the rashness and haughtiness of the despotism which it wielded, James Duane and John Jay being present, the Committee of Duchess-county, with its local military force, was directed to assist in enforcing the Order,[7] as if one who was thus forcibly crowded into the Army, after the manner of the Landgrave of Hesse-Cassel and the other Old World despots, would ever become a useful and effective soldier. The lower portions of Albany-county and the Manor of Livingston, also, asked for the enlistment and establishment of a local military force, for the only purpose of protecting the very few friends of the Convention who lived there, from the far greater number of the "disaffected" who also lived there;[8] and the measure of the anxiety of the Convention was completed by the submission of all Long Island, not excluding the peculiarly zealous revolutionary County of Suffolk, to the authority of the King.[9] In view of these stern facts, there need be no wonder that the Convention was anxious, concerning the "disaffected;" and because of the purely speculative disposition of the Eastern Troops, and of the apathy, if not of the "disaffection," which prevailed in those of the Middle States, especially among those who were forced into the Army, unwilling soldiers, from New York,[10] there need be no wonder that General Washington, also, was anxious, not only concerning the "disaffected" who were within his own command, but concerning, also, those who were scattered throughout New York, in the rural districts as well as within the Cities;[11] nor that he took unto himself the authority to seize and remove from their homes, some of those who were said to have been "disaffected," in many instances, those who had given their paroles and were honorably discharging their respective obligations of peace and quiet,[12] among the former of whom was Frederic Philipse, of Yonkers, whose almost total blindness and entirely harmless life would have undoubtedly sheltered him, had not "a number of well-affected inhabitants" volunteered to assist the General in selecting his victims,[13] and included Mr. Philipse's name on their list of the assumed "disaffected,"[14] who were maliciously said to have been, also, dangerous.[15] As the General expressly

---

[1] *Journal of the Committee of Safety*, "Tuesday, A.M., Fishkill, September the 3d, 1776;" *the Committee of Safety to the Chairman of the Committee of Westchester-county*, "Fishkill, September 3, 1776."

[2] *Journal of the Convention*, "Die Sabbati, 4 ho., P.M., Augt. 10, 1776."

[3] *John Field and Jonathan Paddock to the President of the Convention*, "Duchess, Southeast Precinct, 7th Oct., 1776;" *Journal of the Committee of Safety*, "Die Martis, 9 ho., A.M., Octr. 8, 1776."

[4] Vide pages 172, 173, ante.

[5] Journal of the Committee, "Die Martis, Octo. 8th, P.M., 1776."

[6] Information given, personally, by Colonel Humphrey to the Convention, (*Journal of the Convention*, "Saturday morning, September 28, 1776.")

[7] *Journal of the Convention*, "Saturday morning, September 28, 1776."

[8] *Journal of the Committee of Safety*, "Die Martis, 9 ho., A.M., October 8, 1776."

See, also, *Samuel Ten Broeck, Chairman, pro tem., to the Chairman of the Committee of Safety*, "District of Manor Livingston, October 9, "1776;" *the same to the same*, "District of Manor Livingston, October 10, 1776;" *Petrus Van Gaasbeck, Chairman, to the same*, "Manor "of Livingston, 10th Oct., 1776;" *Journal of the Committee of Safety*, "Saturday morning, Oct. 12, 1776."

[9] "The inhabitants of this island, many of whom had been forced "into rebellion, have all submitted, and are ready to take the Oaths of "Allegiance." (*General Howe to Lord George Germaine*, "Camp at "Newtown, Long Island, 3d September, 1776.")

See, also, *John Sloss Hobart to the Convention*, "Fairfield, Octor. 7, 1776."

[10] Among other authorities, an extract of a letter from General Greene to General Washington, quoted by Sparks, in his *Writings of George Washington* (iv., 9,) is peculiarly noteworthy, in this connection.

[11] *General Washington to General William Livingston*, "Head-quarters, "New-York, 6 July, 5 o'clock, P.M., 1776;" *the same to General George Clinton*, "Head-quarters, New York, 12 July, 1776;" *the same to the "Secret Committee of the Convention of the State of New York*," "Head-"quarters, 13 July, 1776;" *the same to the President of the Provincial Congress of New York*, "New-York Head-quarters, July 14, 1776;" and many others.

[12] *General Washington to Governor Trumbull*, "New-York, 11 August, "1776;" *the same to the Convention*, "Head-quarters, New-York, 12 "August, 1776;" etc.

[13] *General Washington to the Convention*, "Head-quarters, New-York, "12 August, 1776."

[14] *Parole of Frederic Philipse*, "Hartford, Augt. 28, 1776;" *Petition of Frederic Philipse*, "Middletown, 29th Novr. 1776."

[15] Frederic Philipse was taken into custody by an order from General Washington, on the ninth of August, and taken from his own house, at Yonkers, to New Rochelle, "where he was closely confined, under "guard, for eleven days," when he was removed to Connecticut, and gave his *Parole* that he would not go beyond the limits of the Town of Middletown, which no one pretends he attempted to violate. He remained there, until he was officially permitted to go into the City of New York, also on *Parole*. In the trick which was subsequently played on those who had been thus favored, by ordering them to return to Connecticut, but in such a manner that it was evident the *Order* would not

stated that all those were "apprehended only on suspicion,"[1] and that not on the personal knowledge of the General himself, but on information conveyed to him, unquestionably, by the notorious "Committee to detect Conspiracies," who was then sitting in the City in which Head-quarters then were,[2] the same hands directed the movement which had previously directed the similar movements with which the reader is already acquainted; and the Convention was consistent when it thankfully acknowledged the great favor which it then enjoyed, in having received so welcome and so powerful an accession to its power for persecution, as General Washington and the Army of the Continent.[3]

Like the three Congresss who had preceded it, the Convention was kept busy, with matters pertaining to the Army. It authorized and superintended the enlistment of men, in the service of the State, for local purposes;[4] it attended to that of men for the reinforcement of the Continental Army;[5] and it provided for the payment of Bounties, in addition to the stipulated pay, to those who thus enlisted.[6] It resorted to Drafts, in order to fill the requisitions for men, when enlistments were tardy;[7] and where resistance was made to the Draft, force was authorized, to compel men to fill the ranks.[8] It appointed Officers of both the Militia and the troops in the field;[9] it passed on the qualifications of the Surgical Staff;[10] and it gave employment to Chaplains for the Army.[11] Bargains were made with favored Officers, when they entered the service, conditioned that they should serve nowhere else than in the City of New York;[12] and the settlement of disputes among Officers, concerning Rank, occupied much of its time and attention.[13] It exempted the Cavalry from the operations of a general Draft for men;[14] and those who were employed in furnaces for smelting iron, in forges for making bar-iron, in steel-manufactories, in the anchor forge in Orange-county, in saltworks, in paper-mills, and in powder-mills,[15] as well as those in a flaxseed-mill, in Duchess-county,[16] and in the workshops of a gunsmith,[17] were, also, exempted from every kind of military duty.

The Militia, of course, was the sole dependence of the Convention, in every emergency;[18] and, whether well-disposed or "disaffected"[19]—it seemed to be equally

reach them, in the distant City, Mr. Philipse was included among the victims of somebody's official misconduct; and, as the world knows, that unintentional failure to return to his place of confinement, in Connecticut, was made the ostensible reason for the confiscation of his great estate, in Westchester-county and elsewhere.

There is not the slightest evidence that Frederic Philipse was anything else than an honest friend of his native country; that he ever spoke or wrote or did anything whatever which could be justly construed as inimical to his country or favorable to the obnoxious measures of the Home Government; or that he ever purposed doing so. He was almost totally blind; and that and his unusual corpulency unfitted him for the slightest personal opposition to or support of any political or military movements; while his fondness for gardening, in all its branches, to which the grounds of his Manor-houses, at Yonkers and Sleepy Hollow, bore ample testimony, and his domestic ties, and his unusual love of home, led him to prefer the quiet and retired life for which he was distinguished, instead of that more active and more public life to which, from his rank and standing and purity of character, he was so completely entitled.

[1] *General Washington to Governor Trumbull*, "NEW-YORK, 11 August, "1776."

[2] The Convention itself was, then, sitting in the old Dutch Church at Harlem; but the General's correspondence, on the subject under consideration, had been, undoubtedly, with the Committee, who was nearer.

See, also, *General Washington to General William Livingston*, "HEAD-"QUARTERS, NEW-YORK, July 6, 1776, Five o'clock, P.M."

[3] *The Convention to General Washington*, "Tuesday, A.M., Augt. 13, "1776."

[4] *Journal of the Convention*, "Die Lunæ, 8 ho., A.M., July 22, 1776;" *the same*, "Die Martis, 8 ho., A.M., July 23, 1776;" *the Convention to the Deputation in the Continental Congress*, "HARLEM, 7 Augt., 1776;" etc.

[5] *Journal of the Convention*, "Friday afternoon, July 19, 1776;" *the same*, "Die Sabbati, 4 ho., P.M., Augt. 24, 1776;" *the same*, "Saturday "morning, September 28, 1776;" etc.

[6] *Journal of the Convention*, "Die Lunæ, 9 ho., A.M., July 22, 1776;" *Journal of the Committee of Safety*, "AT THE HOUSE OF MR. DEELL, PHIL-"IPSE'S MANOR, Augt. 31, 1776;" etc.

[7] *Journal of the Convention*, "Friday morning, July 16, 1776;" *the same*, "Die Lunæ, 9 ho., A.M., July 22, 1776;" *the same*, "Die Mercurii, "9 ho., A.M., July 31, 1776;" etc.

[8] *Journal of the Convention*, "Saturday morning, September 28, 1776."

[9] *Journal of the Convention*, "Friday morning, July 16, 1776;" *the same*, "Die Sabbati, 9 ho., A.M., July 27, 1776;" *the same*, "Die Sabbati, "9 ho., A.M., Augt. 17, 1776;" etc.

[10] *Journal of the Convention*, "Tuesday, P.M., WHITE PLAINS, July 9, "1776;" *the same*, "Die Sabbati, 3 ho., P.M., July 27, 1776;" *the same*, "Tuesday afternoon, Augt. 20, 1776;" etc.

[11] *Journal of the Convention*, "Monday morning, Augt. 26, 1776."

[12] *Journal of the Convention*, "Die Mercurii, 4 ho., P.M., July 31, 1776."

[13] *Journal of the Convention*, "Tuesday, P.M., WHITE PLAINS, July 9, "1776;" *the same*, "Die Lunæ, 9 ho., A.M., July 22, 1776—the case of "Colonel Drake against Colonel Thomas;" *the same*, "Tuesday morning, "Augt. 13, 1776;" etc.

[14] *Journal of the Convention*, "Die Mercurii, 9 ho., A.M., Augt. 7, 1776."

[15] *Journal of the Convention*, "Die Mercurii, 9 ho., A.M., August 14, "1776."

[16] *Journal of the Convention*, "Monday morning, August 26, 1776."

[17] *Journal of the Committee of Safety*, "Wednesday morning, Septr. 25, "1776."

[18] The authorities are so numerous, that no attempt will be made to cite any of them.

[19] The following, in addition to what has been already stated concerning the disaffection in the Continental Army, presents the subject, very clearly. The Militia of Westchester-county contained, of course, all who were friends of the Convention and who lived within the County; but the number of efficient men in the entire Brigade did not exceed the strength of a single Regiment and these were so generally "disaffected," either with the service or with the General commanding them, or with both, that the latter regarded his own life as in danger, among them; and, therefore, when he was ordered to take the command of his Brigade, personally, in New York, he preferred to remain in Philadelphia, where he would be less exposed: "The situation of my Brigade I was con-"vinced was well known to the Convention," were his words. "I ap-"prehend that not more than a Colonel's command was left in it; and "as such did not think my presence was so absolutely necessary. I have "thought that the existence of such a Brigade, in which were so many "disaffected persons, was dangerous to the cause as well as to my own "life; but being desirous to participate in the virtuous opposition to the "British tyrant, I had determined, as soon as possible, to join General "Washington, and contribute my assistance to him." (*General Lewis Morris to the Convention*, "PHILADELPHIA, Septr. 24, 1776.")

The reader may learn from this how very little the Morrises were respected, even among those who were under legal obligations to respect them, in and throughout Westchester-county, in the Summer of 1776.

The following will further illustrate the "disaffection" of the Militia of Westchester-county, a reasonable result of the outrages which had been officially perpetrated throughout that County, during many months preceding: "We suppose your Excellency has taken the necessary steps "to prevent their landing of any men from the ships, should they be so "inclined, as no reliance at all can be placed on the Militia of West-"chester-county." (*The Committee of Safety to General Washington*, "FISHKILL, 10th Octr., 1776.")

relied on, no matter what its temper might be—it was drawn into the service, while the other States were delinquent,[1] until no more could be taken, for any, except for the most temporary, purposes.[2] It was called out to guard the banks of the Hudson-river[3] and those of Long Island Sound.[4] Reinforcements of the Continental Army were taken from it, whenever reinforcements were called for;[5] the passes in the Highlands were constant sources of anxiety;[6] and the northern borders of the State[7] and Long Island[8] also enjoying its protection. Sometimes it was employed to drive Cattle to places of supposed safety:[9] sometimes it was employed in repairing roads:[10] sometimes, very frequently, it was called from its homes and its necessary labors on the farms, when there was not the slightest appearance of danger, to throw up the defences on which ordinary day-laborers, then suffering from want of employment, had better been employed.

The vessels of war which the Provincial Congresses had equipped and sent to sea, were duly cared for;[11] and it continued to give authority for the equipment of privateers.[12]

As the Convention was largely composed of the same persons as those who had been members of the Provincial Congresses, unto whom the exercise of despotic power has become not only familiar but agreeable and, sometimes, profitable, the same range of authority which those Congresses had usurped was exercised by the Convention, without any other Laws than the promptings of their own wills, as their respective rules of action. It continued, therefore, to provide, as best it could, for the wants of the Army, by manufacturing and by purchasing and distributing among the Powder-mills, all the Saltpeter which it could secure;[13] by making or buying or borrowing Gunpowder, and by distributing it or giving it away;[14] by searching for Lead, and opening Mines, and stripping Window-sashes, in Tryon and Albany-counties, and distributing it or giving it away;[15] and it attended to the search for Sulphur and Flints and Lead, and to the testing of those discovered.[16] It busied itself, also, with the details of distributing Cartridges[17] and Gunflints.[18] Like the Congresses who had preceded it, it engaged, directly, in the manufacture of Arms and Equipments, including that of Lances, with which somebody induced the Convention to attempt to arm the Militia who had been called into the service;[19] and it also bought Arms,

---

[1] "We can with pleasure assure you, that by far the greater part of "the levies ordered by the Congress to be raised from our Militia, are "completed, and at their several stations; that almost the whole of those "drafted in consequence of the enclosed Resolution, will, by the time "this reaches you, be at posts which is thought necessary to occupy, "least the enemy should cut off the communication between the Army at "New York and the country." * * * "It gives us great pain to in-"form you that the aid received from our sister States is very inadequate "to our expectations, none of them having yet completed the levies di-"rected by Congress, which leaves us reason to fear that instead of using "every means that human wisdom dictates for ensuring success, we shall, "with inferior numbers, on the doubtful issue of a single battle, hazard "the glorious cause for which we have struggled." (*The Convention to the Delegation of the State in the Continental Congress*, "HARLEM, 7th Au-"gust, 1776, A.M.")

[2] *The Convention to General Washington*, "FISHKILL, 10th Octr., 1776."

[3] The entire body of Westchester-county Militia was ordered to the mouth of the Croton-river, to oppose any movements, in that County, from the enemy's shipping, (*Journal of the Convention*, "Thursday morn-"ing, July 25, 1776;") to which the local Company, commanded by Captain Micah Towusend, was added, on the following day, (*the same*, "Die "Veneris, 9 ho., A.M., July 26, 1776.") The entire body of the Militia of Westchester-county was again called out, for the same purpose, with five days' provisions, a fortnight afterwards, (*the same*, "Die Sabbati, 4 "ho., P.M., Augt. 10, 1776.") The Militia of Orange-county, below the Highlands—now Rockland-county—was ordered out for the protection of the western shore of the river, early in the Autumn, (*the same*, "Thursday afternoon, October 10, 1776.")

[4] General Morris was instructed to guard the Sound-shore of Westchester-county, at the same time that he guarded the left bank of the Hudson. (*Journal of the Convention*, "Die Sabbati, 4 ho., P.M., Augt. 10, 1776.")

See, also, *Colonel Joseph Drake to the Convention*, "Wednesday morn-"ing, Augt. 28, 1776;" *the Convention's reply*, "Thursday morning, "Augt. 29, 1776."

[5] One fourth of the entire body of the Militia of Westchester, Dutchess, Ulster, and Orange-counties, to serve until the last day of the following December, was ordered out for general service, in July, (*Journal of the Convention*, "Friday morning, July 16, 1776;" *the same*, "Die "Jovis, 4 ho., P.M., Augt. 8, 1776;") one fifth of the entire body of the Militia of Albany-county, to serve for one month, and one-half of that of Kings and Queens counties, to serve until the first of September, were added to these, very soon after, (*the same*, "Die Sabbati, 4 ho. P.M., "Augt. 10, 1776;") and, a few days later, the entire body of the Militia of Orange, Ulster, Westchester, and Dutchess-counties was ordered to hold itself in readiness to march, at a moment's warning, with five days' provisions and as much ammunition as possible, (*Journal of the Committee of Safety*, "HARLEM, Augt. 29, 1776.")

[6] The entries on this subject are so very numerous that we can pretend to cite no more than two or three of them, (*Journal of the Convention*, "Friday morning, July 16, 1776;" *the same*, "Die Jovis, 4 ho., P.M., "Augt. 8, 1776;" etc.)

[7] *The Convention to the Delegation from the State, in the Continental Congress*, "HARLEM, 7th August, 1776, A.M.;" *Journal of Committee of Safety*, "Tuesday morning, Octor. 22, 1776;" etc.

[8] *Instructions to General Woodhull—Journal of the Convention*, "Monday "morning, Augt. 26, 1776."

[9] *General Woodhull to the Convention*, "JAMAICA, August 27, 1776;" etc.

[10] The road from the North side of the Highlands to Kingsbridge and "a certain other small road which leads from the Post-road aforesaid to "the dock, at Dobbs's ferry," were ordered to be repaired; and requisitions on the Militia of Dutchess and Westchester-counties, were made for that particular purpose, (*Journal of the Provincial Convention*, "9 ho., "A.M., Octor. 5, 1776.")

[11] *Journal of the Convention*, "Saturday morning, September 28, 1776;" *Journal of the Committee of Safety*, "Die Lunæ, 9 ho., A.M., October 7, "1776;" *the same*, "Wednesday afternoon, Octor. 16, 1776;" etc.

[12] *Journal of the Convention*, "Die Veneris, 4 ho., P.M., Augt. 2, 1776."

[13] *Journal of the Convention*, "Die Mercurii, 9 ho., A.M., Augt. 14, "1776;" *the same*, "Die Sabbati, 9 ho., A.M., Septr. 14, 1776;" etc.

[14] *Journal of the Convention*, "Friday morning, July 19, 1776;" *Order from General Washington to John Livingston, in favor of the Convention*, "NEW YORK, July 19, 1776;" *Journal of the Convention*, "Die Sabbati, "4 ho., P.M., Augt. 10, 1776;" *the same*, "Die Mercurii, 9 ho., A.M., "July 24, 1776;" etc.

[15] *Journal of the Committee of Safety*, "Die Lunæ, 9 ho., A.M., Augt. 19, "1776;" *Journal of the Convention*, "Thursday afternoon, July 11, "1776;" *the same*, "Thursday morning, July 18, 1776;" *the same*, "Die "Sabbati, 9 ho., A.M., Octor. 5, 1776;" *the same*, "Die Sabbati, 9 ho., "A.M., July 27, 1776;" etc.

[16] *Journal of the Convention*, "Die Jovis, 9 ho., A.M., Septr. 19, 1776."

[17] *Journal of the Convention*, "Saturday morning, July 13, 1776."

[18] *Journal of the Convention*, "Thursday morning, July 18, 1776;" *the same*, "Die Sabbati, 9 ho., A.M., July 27, 1776;" *the same*, "Die Lunæ, "9 ho., A.M., Augt. 5, 1776;" etc.

[19] *Journal of the Convention*, "Die Mercurii, 9 ho., A.M., July 31, 1776;" *the same*, "Friday morning, August 2, 1776;" *Journal of the Committee of Safety*, "Die Mercurii, 4 ho., P.M., Sept. 4, 1776;" etc.

The manufacture of four thousand lances was assigned to the Com-

when it could do so,[1] and, sometimes, it hired Arms, when it could not in other way procure them.[2] In short, there seemed to be nothing left, in all which related to the raising, the equipment of, and the furnishing of supplies for, the troops, which was permitted to be done by any other agency; and it affords subjects for thought and inquiry, as one reads of its uninvited interference with the instructions of the Quartermaster-general of the Continental Army to his subordinates, concerning purchases of Timber and Oak-plank and old Vessels, for the obstruction of the Hudson-river;[3] of its direct participation in the purchase of Lime, Brick, Oak-plank, Cordwood, Grain, and Clothing for the Continental Army, although the Quartermaster-general's officers were present and engaged in the same work;[4] and when it also found employment in attending to the Cooperage of leaky Oil-casks belonging to the Continent.[5]

The establishment of a new form of Government received the dilatory and half-hearted attention of the Convention—an abridgement of their existing despotic authority was opposed by the Deputies who then exercised it;[6] and there was a lingering, longing desire, among the master-spirits of the Convention, for a reconciliation with the Mother Country and a restoration of the former form of Colonial Government, evidently with themselves and their friends administering it.[7]

The subject was introduced into the Convention, very properly, on the day after that body had approved and accepted the *Declaration of Independence;* but the consideration of it was postponed, from time to time, until the first of August, when a Committee was appointed for the purpose of taking into consideration and reporting a plan for instituting and framing a *Form of Government*, together with a *Bill of Rights*, ascertaining and declaring the essential Rights and Privileges of "the good people of this State," as a foundation for such *Form of Government*, with instructions to report to the Convention, on the twenty-sixth

---

ties of Albany, Ulster, Orange, Duchess, and Westchester, eight hundred to each; and, in the last-named County, Stephen Ward, William Millar, and Thaddeus Crane were appointed "to procure the proportion "of Lances affixed to their respective names." (*Journal of Committee of Safety*, "Die Mercurii, 4 ho., P.M., Sept. 4, 1776.") Models were made from Spears procured in New York, (*the same*, "Die Lunæ, 11 ho., A.M., "Sept. 9, 1776;") and, including the long handles, five shillings and six-pence was paid for those which were not steeled, and six shillings and six-pence for those which were steeled, (*Journal of the Convention*, "Die "Jovis, 9 ho., A.M., Octor. 3, 1776.")

We have not met the slightest notice of the use of those four thousand Lances, in the service or elsewhere; and it is more than probable that they were never used, by any one.

[1] *Journal of the Convention*, "Die Mercurii, 9 ho., A.M., Aug. 21, 1776;" etc.

[2] *Journal of the Convention*, "Die Mercurii, 9 ho., A.M., August 14, 1776."

[3] *Journal of the Convention*, "Die Sabbati, 9 ho., A.M., Septr. 21, 1776."

[4] *Journal of the Convention*, "Monday morning, September 30, 1776;" *Journal of the Committee of Safety*, "Die Lunæ, 9 ho., A.M., October 7, "1776;" *the same*, "Die Mercurii, 9 ho., A.M., Octr. 9, 1776; *the same*, "Thursday morning, Octor. 17, 1776;" etc.

Stephen Ward, Gilbert Strang, and Phil. Leake were appointed to purchase coarse woollen Cloth, Linsey-woolsey, Blankets, woollen Hose, Mittens, coarse Linen, felt Hats, and Shoes, for the soldiers, and to have the Linen made up into Shirts, all in Westchester county; and three hundred pounds—seven hundred and fifty dollars—were appropriated for that purpose. (*Journal of the Committee of Safety*, "Die Mercurii, 9 ho., A.M., "Octr. 9, 1776.") Although there were supplies of Grain much nearer to the Army, and vastly more exposed to the enemy's foraging parties, no Grain was purchased elsewhere than in the Livingston Manor, from which three thousand bushels of Oats, at four shillings per bushel, and four thousand bushels of old Corn and one thousand bushels of Rye, the two latter at five shillings per bushel, were drawn, at one time; but Peter R. Livingston was President of the Convention, and Gilbert Livingston and James Livingston and Philip Livingston and Robert R. Livingston and James Duane and John Jay and Pierre Van Cortlandt—the last-named three having been Livingstons by their marriages—were members of that Convention; and six of them were present when the order was given. (*Journal of the Convention*, "Monday morning, Septem-"ber 30, 1776.")

Need there be any surprise that, with such an array of strong men in its favor, that he more distant and less exposed Manor of Livingston should be chosen, especially since the purchasing agent of the Quartermaster-general of the Continental Army was at Fishkill, with funds to meet the drafts of Dirck Jansen, who was selected by the Convention, to gather the grain from the farmers or from the manorial storehouses, and, also, especially since no inspection of either the quantity or the quality of what was to be thus purchased, was provided for.

[5] *Journal of the Committee of Safety*, "Friday morning, September 27, "1776."

[6] As late in the year as the early days of October, the attempt of the County-clerk of Duchess-county to continue the old practice of holding a County Court for that County was formally forbidden by the Convention, John Jay, James Duane, and Robert R. Livingston having been present in the Convention, (*Journal of the Convention*, "Die Sabbati, 9 ho., "A.M., Octor. 5, 1776.")

[7] There need be no better evidence of that fact, although there is an abundance, elsewhere, than in the successive orders for the issue of Bills of Credit, by the Convention. It continued to issue such Bills, in the name of the Colony, long after it had professed to accept the Declaration of Independence, by which it had ceased to be a Colony, (*Journal of the Convention*, "Die Mercurii, 9 ho., A.M., Augt. 7, 1776") and, subsequently, when a new issue of such Bills of Credit was ordered to be printed, (*Journal of the Convention*, "Die Martis, 5 ho., P.M., August 13, "1776") it was ordered to be printed with the insignia of the Corporation of the City of New York, (*Ibid.*;) and the engravers of the several plates were instructed to leave a blank space where the name of the maker of the obligation should be, on those plates, in order that such name as should be subsequently found to be most useful—the Colony, the State, the City, or something else—might be inserted, with type, after the sheets should have been printed on the plate-press—conclusive evidence that the permanence of the new-formed State was regarded by even the master spirits of the Convention, as very questionable.

In the same connection, it may be well to inquire and to consider what the Earl of Coventry meant, when, in his place in the House of Lords, on the twenty-fifth of November, 1779, he said, "He lamented that a "War so fatal to Great Britain should ever have been begun, much more "that it should be continued with so much obstinacy; and declared that, "had the House paid attention to the propositions which he, the last "Session, informed them he was authorized to make from two persons "of authority and influence, in America, and which, had they been "listened to, by Parliament, and agreed to, would have been ratified by "Congress, we should have been, at this hour, in peace with America." —*Speech of the Earl of Coventry, in the House of Lords*, in Almon's *Parliamentary Register*, xv., 17.

"The last Session," during which the Earl of Coventry, by authority, presented overtures for reconciliation to which the Continental Congress would have agreed, was the Fifth Session of the Fourteenth Parliament of Great Britain, (November 26, 1778, to July 3, 1779,) long after the alliance of the United States with France had been perfected, and utilized in America. As the Earl, on another occasion, boldly acknowledged his personal friendship and correspondence with more than one of those who, then, were regarded as prime leaders in the Rebellion, there need be very little trouble in searching for the names of those who were, undoubtedly, the mouthpieces of the Continental Congress, in the work of reconciliation, on the occasion referred to by the Earl of Coventry, in 1779.

of August, less than four weeks from the date of its appointment.[1] The Committee which was appointed for those purposes consisted of John Jay, Colonel John Broome, and General John Morin Scott, all of the City of New York; John Sloss Hobart and William Smith, of Suffolk; Abraham Yates, Junior, and Robert Yates, of Albany-county; Henry Wisner, Senior, and Colonel Charles De Witt, of Ulster-county; William Duer, of Charlotte-county; Gouverneur Morris, of Westchester-county; Samuel Townshend, of Queens-county; and Robert R. Livingston, of Duchess-county.[2]

The subject continued to be played with, both by the Committee and the Convention, by both of whom nothing was done, until the Royal Army occupied the City of New York and prepared to extend its operations into Westchester-county, when other subjects occupied the attention of both; and thus were the best interests and the safety of the inhabitants of the State endangered—thus were their properties and their families and everything which was dear to them, subjected to the hazard of a revolutionary uprising, of anarchy, and of entire destruction—only because James Duane and John Jay and the Livingstons and the Morrisses and their friends preferred a reconciliation and a reconstruction of the former system of Government, with themselves in the offices; and, for the promotion of those selfish purposes, withheld every form of Government from the young State, and exposed every one and everything, within the State, to lawless anarchy and entire ruin.

There was scarcely a matter, in either the Judicial or the Legislative or the Executive departments of Government, with which that Congress did not interfere;[3] and it ventured to ask the Continental Congress, only because it lacked courage enough to do so, to revise the *Book of Common Prayer* and to exercise an official censorship over the prayers of those who did not use Rituals.[4]

While the Convention was thus busily employed—and justice requires that its industry and determination, in preparing for a successful opposition to the Royal Armies, on the northern frontiers as well as in the vicinity of New York, should be fully and properly recognized—other events of the utmost importance to New York and to her sister States, were of everyday occurrence.

As we have already stated, the Royal troops which had been withdrawn from Boston and carried to Halifax, during the preceding March, "having sufficiently recovered from the fatigues and sickness "occasioned by their confined situation in that town" [*Boston*,[5]] left the later place, [*Halifax*] on the eleventh of June,[6] under convoy of Admiral Shuldham;[7] reached Sandy-hook on the twenty-ninth of the same month;[8] landed on the northeastern shore of Staten-Island, between the second and fourth of July;[9] and were welcomed by the persecuted inhabitants of that beautiful island, as their deliverers from the terrible oppression of the revolutionary powers, both that of New York and that of New Jersey.[10]

On the afternoon of the twelfth of July, for the purpose of distressing the American Army, "by "obstructing supplies coming down the river and other "good consequences dependent on that measure"—probably, also, for the purpose of offering encouragement to the conservative farmers of Westchester-county to follow the example of those on Staten Island, in declaring for the King—the *Phœnix*, commanded by Captain Hyde Parker, of forty guns, the *Rose*, commanded by Captain Wallace, of twenty

[1] *Journal of the Convention*, "Die Jovis, 8 ho., A.M., August 1, 1776."

[2] Ibid.

[3] Without entering into details, the Convention provided for the refugee Poor, from the City of New York; protected the Cattle of the farmers, from the enemy's foraging parties, as far as it could do so; guarded the Military-stores of the State; built Vessels-of-War; obstructed the navigation of the Hudson river; arbitrarily set aside the Elections of Officers who were distasteful to it; borrowed Money, whenever they could find lenders; treated with the Indians; issued Paper-currency; gave employment to grambling Mechanics; watched the "disaffected," in New Jersey; lent Money to impecunious County Committees; guarded the official Records; ordered Fasts; gave Passes to those making journeys; seized the Royal Quitrents; removed those who were exposed to the enemy; provided postal facilities; gave Licenses to Innkeepers; gave relief to insolvent Debtors; provided for the care of Orphans; relieved distressed Soldiers; etc., etc.

The *Journals of the Convention* and those of its *Committee of Safety* may be referred to, by those who shall desire further information concerning the action of the Convention or the Committee, thereon.

[4] "We take the liberty of suggesting to your consideration, also, the "propriety of taking some measures for expunging from the *Book of* "*Common Prayer*, such parts, and discontinuing in the Congregations "of all other denominations, all such prayers, as interfere with the in-"terest of the American cause. It is a subject we are afraid to meddle "with, the enemies of America having taken great pains to insinuate "into the minds of the Episcopalians that the Church was in danger. "We would wish the Congress would pass some Resolve, to quiet their "fears; and we are confident it would do essential service to the cause of "America, at least in this State." (*Journal of the Provincial Convention*, "Thursday morning, July 11, 1776.")

[5] *History of the Civil War in America*. By an Officer of the Army [*Captain Hall*] i., 173; Stedman's *History of the American War*, Ed. London, 1794, i., 190.

The *Annual Register for* 1776: *History of Europe*, 166,* 167,* and, following that authority, *The History of the War in America between Great Britain and her Colonies*, Ed. Dublin, 1779, i., 179, 180, and Murray's *Impartial History of the War in America*, Edit. Newcastle, ii., 153, say the troops were not comfortable at Halifax; and that General Howe was obliged to sail from there, because of a scarcity of provisions; but we prefer the statement of Captain Hall, who was present, and who wrote with unusual precision and accuracy, especially with Stedman supporting him.

[6] *History of the Civil War in America*, [Capt. Hall's] i., 173; Stedman's *History of the American War*, i., 190.

[7] *General Howe to Lord George Germaine*, "STATEN ISLAND, 7 July, "1776;" *Annual Register for* 1776: *History of Europe*, 167.*

[8] *General Howe to Lord George Germaine*, "STATEN ISLAND, 7 July, "1776;" [Hall's] *History of the Civil War in America*, i., 174; Stedman's *History of the American War*, i., 190; Marshall's *Life of George Washington*, Ed. Phila., 1801, ii., 415.

[9] *General Howe to Lord George Germaine*, "STATEN ISLAND, 7 July, "1776;" [Hall's] *History of the Civil War in America*, i., 175; Gordon's *History of the American Revolution*, Ed. London, 1788, ii., 278; etc.

[10] *General Howe to Lord George Germaine*, "STATEN ISLAND, 7 July, "1776;" General Howe's *Observations upon a pamphlet entitled* Letters to a Nobleman, Ed. London, 1780, 50; *London Gazette*, "ADMIRALTY OFFICE, "August 10, 1776;" *Governor Tryon to Lord George Germaine*" DUCHESS "OF GORDON, OFF STATEN ISLAND, July 8, 1776," *John Adams to Mrs. Adams*, "PHILADELPHIA, 11 July, 1776."

guns, and three tenders, "taking advantage of the "tide and a fresh breeze," left Staten Island, and passed the City, receiving the fire of the American batteries on the Red Hook, Governor's Island, Powle's Hook, and along the line of the Hudson-river, within the City, without sustaining any material damage, and returning a fire which was equally harmless.[1] They anchored off Tarrytown, during the early evening;[2] but, if their errand was to encourage the farmers on the Philipse Manor to declare themselves favorably inclined to the King, their officers must have been sadly disappointed, since Lieutenant Daniel Martling, with whom the reader is already acquainted, on the first appearance of the approaching vessels, promptly ordered his command to turn out, to oppose any attempt which might be made to effect a landing; and, during the night, under the personal direction of Lieutenant-colonel Hammond, who lived in the vicinity, cartridges were distributed, and the inhabitants of the village and neighboring farms were collected, in order that an effective resistance should be made.[3] Fresh supplies of ammunition were sent, by the Convention, then in session at the White Plains; and measures were taken for reinforcing the inhabitants;[4] but, although it is said the ships were visited by one or two periaugas,[5] they appeared, while they remained off Tarrytown, to have been sent for no other purpose than to take soundings,[6] although there is little doubt that they also cut off the supplies, as well as the communication between the main Army and that on the northern frontier,[7] and availed themselves of the darkness of night to open communications with those of the neighboring inhabitants of Westchester and Orange-counties, who were supposed to have been friendly to the Royal cause.

The successful passage of these ships, up the river, very reasonably, created much anxiety and alarm, in the Army and throughout the State. General Washington, wisely suspecting that the purpose of the movement was to encourage the tenantry on the Manors of Philipsborough and Cortlandt to declare for the King, immediately ordered General George Clinton, then commanding the Militia who had been called out for the protection of the passes over the Highlands, to desire General Ten Broeck, commanding the Militia above the Highlands, to march down with as great a force as he could collect, in order the more effectually to secure those passes, particularly the road which passed over Anthony's Nose; and, at the same time, he authorized General Clinton, if there should seem to be any danger from those who were "disaffected," to send an express to Connecticut, desiring the western portion of that State "to col-"lect all their forces at the same point."[8] As we have already stated, the Convention of the State, then seated at the White Plains, besides sending advices of the threatened inroad to the officer commanding the fort in the Highlands, also sent a supply of powder and ball to the inhabitants of Tarrytown, and provided for reinforcements, "along that shore," and solicited protection for King's Bridge, "the destruction "of which it apprehended to have been an object "with the enemy."[9]

On the fourteenth of July, General Washington wrote to the Convention a letter which is so significant of the great anxiety which he felt and so highly illustrative of his character, as a great commander, that we make room for it, in this place.

"NEW-YORK HEAD-QUARTERS.
"July 14th, 1776.

"GENTLEMEN:—

"The passage of the enemy up the North-river is "an event big with many consequences to the public "interest. One particularly occurs to me well deserving your attention, and to prevent which I shall "gladly give every assistance in my power, consistent "with the safety of the Army.

"I am informed there are several passes, on each "side of the river, upon which the communication "with Albany depends, of so commanding a nature "that an inconsiderable body of men may defend "them against the largest numbers. It may be that, "on board these ships, there may be troops for that "purpose, who, expecting to be joined by the disaffected, in that quarter, or confiding in their own "strength, may endeavour to seize those defiles, in "which case the intercourse between the two Armies, "both by land and water, will be wholly cut off, than "which a greater misfortune could hardly befall the "Province and Army. I must entreat you to take "the measure into consideration, and, if possible, "provide against an evil so much to be apprehended. "I should hope the Militia of those Counties might be "used on such an emergency, until further provision "was made.

"I have also thought it very probable these ships

[1] *General Howe to Lord George Germaine*, "STATEN ISLAND, 8 July, "1776;" *the same to the same*, "STATEN ISLAND, 6 August, 1776;" *General Washington to General Clinton*, "HEAD-QUARTERS, NEW "YORK, 12 July, 1776;" *the same to the President of Congress*, "NEW "YORK, 14 July, 1776;" *the same to General Schuyler*, "NEW YORK, 15 "July, 1776;" *Memoirs of Major-general Heath*, Ed. Boston, 1798, 49; [Hall's] *History of the Civil War in America*, i., 185, 186; Gordon's *History of the American Revolution*, ii, 304.

[2] *The Convention of New York to General Washington*, "Saturday morn-"ing, July 13, 1776;" [Hall's] *History of the Civil War in America*, i., 185; Gordon's *History of the American Revolution*, ii., 304.

[3] *Report and Evidence in the Case of Lieutenant-colonel Hammond.—Historical Manuscripts: Miscellaneous Papers*, xxxiv., 549.

[4] *The Convention to General Washington*, "Saturday Morning, July 13, "1776."

[5] *The Convention to General Washington* "IN CONVENTION, July 15, 1776."

[6] *The Convention to General Washington*, "Saturday morning, July 13, "1776."

[7] *General Washington to John Augustine Washington*, "NEW YORK, 22 "July, 1776."

[8] *General Washington to General George Clinton*, "HEAD-QUARTERS, "NEW YORK, 12 July, 1776."

[9] *The Convention to General Washington*, "Saturday morning, July 13, "1776."

"may have carried up arms and ammunition to be "dealt out to those who may favour their cause, and "cooperate with them at a fixed time. I would, to "guard against this, submit to your consideration the "propriety of writing to the leading men, on our "side, in those Counties, to be very vigilant in ob-"serving any movement of that kind, in order that "so dangerous a scheme may be nipped in the bud; "for that purpose, to keep the utmost attention to "the conduct of the principal Tories in those parts, "any attempts of intercourse with the ships, and all "other circumstances which may lead to a discovery "of their schemes and the destruction of their meas-"ures.

"I am, Gentlemen, very respectfully,
"Your mo. obt. and very hble. servant,
"GEO. WASHINGTON.

"TO THE HONBLE. THE PREST. OF THE
"PROVINCIAL CONGRESS OF NEW-YORK."

As we have said, the inhabitants of the vicinity of Tarrytown turned out for the purpose of obstructing any attempt which might be made, to effect a landing from the ships;[1] but they were farmers, in the midst of their harvest; and when they had been there three days, without having seen much pressing necessity for their further stay or any prospect of a relief or of a supply of provisions, although the Convention was sitting within six miles from them, they expressed their desire to be relieved, and some of them went home, without leave, "in order to attend to their har-"vests."[2]

Very ungraciously and, certainly, not in such words as were calculated to inspire respect for those who had employed them, among those against whom they were thus tossed, by the aristocratic master-spirits of the Convention,[3] Orders were issued to Captain Micah Townsend, who had probably been sent from the Plains to Tarrytown, on the day after the arrival of the ships, to remain at the latter place, with his Company; Colonel Thomas was ordered to send detachments from his Regiment, to relieve those who had not returned to their homes; and the pay and rations allowed to the Continental troops, were promised to those who were, as well as to those who should be, called into the service.[4] But, on the following day, [*July* 16, 1776,] all those in the neighborhood of Tarrytown were relieved from immediate danger, by the ships and their tenders weighing their anchors and sailing up the river, occasionally firing a shot, as they passed a house on the western side the river; and by their anchoring a short distance below Verplanck's-point, and "opposite the stores at Hav-"erstraw." During the afternoon of the same day, one of the tenders beat up the river, against an unfavorable wind, sounding the river very carefully as she proceeded, until she had come within gun-shot of Fort Montgomery, when her progress was arrested by a thirty-two pound shot, which struck her, and compelled her to put about, and to run down the river, not, however, without having plundered a little house which stood near the river.[5]

During the morning of that day, [*July* 16, 1776,] before the information of the departure of the ships from Tarrytown had reached the Convention, that body had provided for the removal of "all Provisions and "other Stores, as well private as public property, which "were stored in places within the district of Peekskill "and so situated as to be in danger of being taken by "the enemy," "to such places of safety as the Sub-"committee of Peekskill shall think proper;" and when the information of the departure of the ships was received from Lieutenant-colonel Hammond, the Convention very promptly despatched Colonel Pierre Van Cortlandt and Zephaniah Platt, the former a Deputy from Westchester-county and the latter one from Duchess-county, "to the Highlands, in order to "call out such Militia as they may think necessary for "the defence and security of this State; to direct "their stations; to reinforce the garrisons of Forts "Montgomery and Constitution, if expedient; and to "supply such forces as may be called out or to ap-"point proper persons for that purpose;" at the same time, promising Continental pay and rations to the Militia who should be thus employed; and advancing five hundred dollars, to be disposed of in procuring Provisions for the forces who should thus be called into active service.[6] The Convention further signified, at the same Session, its determination to protect the State, as far as it could do so, by ordering into immediate service, one-fourth of the entire body of Militia of the Counties of Westchester, Duchess, Orange—which then included what is now known as Rockland—and Ulster-counties, "for the defence of the liber-"ties, property, wives, and children of the good peo-"ple of this State; and as, at this busy season of the "year, the service may be inconvenient to many of "them, each man be allowed twenty dollars, as a "Bounty, with Continental pay and subsistence, and "be continued in the service until the last day of "December next, unless sooner discharged." At the same time, the men to be raised in Westchester and Duchess-counties were ordered to repair, immediately, to Peekskill; General Washington was requested to appoint an officer to take command of all the levies to be raised, on both sides the river; to designate what stations they should occupy; and to nominate two Deputy Commissaries for the troops, on each side

[1] Vide page 208, ante.

[2] *Journal of the Convention*, "Die Lunæ, P.M., July 15, 1776."

[3] *The Convention to Lieutenant-colonel Hammond*, "IN CONVENTION FOR "THE STATE OF NEW-YORK, WHITE PLAINS, July 15, 1776."

[4] *Journal of the Convention*, "Die Lunæ, P.M., July 15, 1776;" *the Convention to Lieutenant-colonel Hammond*, "IN CONVENTION FOR THE "STATE OF NEW-YORK, WHITE PLAINS, July 15, 1776."

[5] *Lieutenant-colonel Hammond to the Convention*, "TARRYTOWN, July "16, 1776;" *General Clinton to General Washington*, "FORT MONTGOM-"ERY, July 23, 1776."

[6] *Journal of the Convention*, "Friday morning, July 16, 1776."

of the river; and those who were already in the service, from Orange and Ulster-counties, were ordered to be posted in the Highlands, to guard the defiles, therein, which were westward from the Hudson-river, as General Clinton should direct. The provisions of these enactments were completed by the appointment of Colonel Thomas Thomas as the Colonel-commanding and Ebenezer Purdy as the Major, of the troops which were to be drawn from Westchester-county[1]—an appointment of Colonel which was made in the hurry of the moment and under a misapprehension, the Convention having erroneously supposed Colonel Thomas was the senior Colonel of the Westchester-county Militia, whereas the seniority rested on Colonel Drake; and which Election, subsequently, produced a serious rupture in the military circles of the County, and between the two rivals and their respective friends,[2] since Colonel Thomas resolutely retained the authority which he had thus received by mistake.[3] A guard of fifty men was also provided for the protection of the public stores of Provisions, at or near Peekskill;[4] and the Commissioners for building the Continental Ships, at Poughkeepsie, were requested to exert their utmost abilities and attention to defend those Ships from the hostile attempts of the enemy, and, if nothing else, to preserve the Oak-plank, Rigging, and other Stores from falling into his hands.[5]

In the afternoon of the same day, [*July* 16, 1776,] the Convention appointed a secret Committee "to devise and carry into execution such measures as to "them shall appear most effectual for obstructing "the channel of Hudson's-river, or annoying the enemy's ships in their navigation up the said river; "and that this Convention pledge themselves for defraying the charges incident thereto." That Committee was composed of John Jay, of the City of New York, Robert Yates, of Albany-county, Major Christopher Tappen, of Ulster-county, William Paulding, of Westchester-county, and Robert R. Livingston and Gilbert Livingston, both of Duchess-county. At the same time, a messenger was ordered to be sent to Governor Trumbull for the purpose of requesting him to order the forces of western Connecticut to be called out, for the further support of those who were occupying the passes in the Highlands;[6] a Resolution, requesting "all Magistrates and other officers of justice in this State, who were well affected to the liberties of America, until further orders, to exercise their "respective offices," was adopted; and the Convention also adopted Resolutions declaring that "all persons "abiding within the State of New York and deriving "protection from the Laws of the same, owe Allegiance "to the said Laws, and are members of the State: that "all persons passing through, visiting, or making a "temporary stay in the said State, being entitled to "the protection of the Laws, during the time of such "passage, visitation, or temporary stay, owe, during "the same time, Allegiance thereto; and that all "persons, members of or owing Allegiance to this "State, as before described, who shall levy War "against the said State, within the same, or be adherent to the King of Great Britain or others the enemies of the said State, within the same, giving to "him or them, aid and comfort, are guilty of Treason "against the State, and being thereof convicted, shall "suffer the pains and penalties of Death!"[7] The Convention also "earnestly recommended to the General Committees of the Counties and the Sub-Committees in the Districts of the several Counties in "this State, immediately to apprehend and secure all

---

[1] *Journal of the Convention*, "Friday morning, July 16, 1776."

[2] *Journal of the Convention*, "Die Lunæ, 9 ho., A.M., July 22, 1776;" *the same*, "Die Lunæ, 4 ho., P.M., July 22, 1776;" *Colonel Joseph Drake to the Convention*, "WHITE PLAINS, 23 July, 1776;" *the same to General Morris*, "NEW ROCHELLE, July 24, 1776;" *the same to the Convention*, "NEW ROCHELLE, 6 August, 1776."

[3] *Preamble and Resolution of the Convention*, "Die Lunæ, 4 ho., P.M., "July 22, 1776."

[4] *The Convention to Colonel Pierre Van Cortlandt*, "IN CONVENTION OF "THE REPRESENTATIVES OF THE STATE OF NEW-YORK, WHITE PLAINS, "July 16, 1776."

[5] *The Convention to Jacobus Van Zandt, in his absence, to the Captains Lawrence and Tuder, or either of them, at Poukeepsie*, "IN CONVENTION "OF THE REPRESENTATIVES OF THE STATE OF NEW-YORK, WHITE PLAINS, "July 16, 1776."

[6] It appears that it was subsequently considered advisable to send a Committee of the Convention, instead of a letter by the hands of a Messenger; and Colonel John Broome, of New York City, and William Piner, of Charlotte-county, were selected for that purpose. (*General Washington to the President of the Continental Congress*, "NEW YORK, 19 "July, 1776.")

[7] These Resolutions are almost identical with other Resolutions, of the same tenor, which had been adopted by the Continental Congress, on the twenty-fourth of June preceding, (*vide pages* 179, 180, *ante*;) but, because of the subsequent abrogation of all the Laws of the Colony, and because no other Laws had been enacted, even provisionally, to take their places, the truth was, that, on the day of the adoption of these Resolutions, by the Convention, there were no Laws, of any kind, in force, within the State, nor any Courts to try offenders, of any kind; and the Resolutions were, therefore, practically, mere buncombe, meaning nothing.

But the ridiculousness of the Resolutions was not confined to their allusions to Laws which had been formally abrogated and to Courts which had been as formally abolished. Obedience to the Laws, had there been any Laws, would have been truly due from every one within the limits of the State; but that was something which was entirely distinct from Allegiance, which was not due to the Laws but to the Sovereign to whose supreme authority the person was legally subject, and from whom even the Laws themselves, had there been any, had derived all the authority which they could have possibly possessed. Treason has always consisted, and still consists, of something else than a mere misdemeanor or a simple felony; and the subject of another Sovereign, although a violator of the *local* law, to which he properly owed obedience, could not, then nor since, have been legally tried and convicted of Treason, for any such violation of the local Law, in the State of New York or elsewhere, else, under these Resolutions, every officer and soldier of the Royal Army, whether British or Irish or German, who were within the State of New York, on and after the sixteenth of July, 1776, were Traitors "against the State," liable to be tried for that very capital offence, and to "suffer the pains and "penalties of Death," therefor.

The Convention, in its eagerness to secure the State, made itself ridiculous by the passage of such Resolutions, especially since it was exercising despotic authority, unrestrained by any Law, and needed no such Resolution as a warrant for declaring any one, no matter whom, either with or without a reason, to have been a traitor, and to have hung and quartered him after the most approved fashion of despots, had it inclined to have done so.

"such persons, whose going at large, at this critical "time, they shall deem dangerous to the Liberties of "this State;"[1] and the measure of its zeal was filled by asking a loan from General Washington, for the payment of what it had undertaken to do, promising to "take the earliest care to replace what nothing "but urgent necessity would have induced it to bor-"row;" by requesting him to send an immediate supply of Ammunition for the troops who were already in motion and "but ill-supplied" with that very necessary article; by expressing a fear to him that the enemy would attempt "to cut off the communication "between the City and country, by landing above "Kingsbridge," and its desire to "have some force "ready to hang on his rear, in case such a step should "be taken;" and by suggesting to the General, also, that if Governor Trumbull would form a Camp of six thousand men, at Byram-river, the westernmost limit of Connecticut, any designs which the enemy might have, to land above Kingsbridge, would become "ex-"tremely hazardous."[2]

While the Convention was thus bravely and, generally, with excellent judgment, employed in making preparations for a vigorous and effective resistance, whatever the purposes of the enemy may have been, General Clinton, then at Fort Montgomery, as we have already seen, not only welcomed one of the enemy's tenders, which was beating up the river, taking soundings as she went, with a thirty-two pound shot, which caused her to put about and run down the river, to the place where the ships had anchored; but he also made preparations for the removal of all the goods, from the storehouses, and all the Cattle, Sheep, etc., from the farms which were contiguous to the river, to places of safety; and, on the following day, [*July* 17, 1776,] he went down with a force sufficiently strong to do what he had proposed; successfully removed what had not yet been removed by others; and left one hundred and eighty Militia, under the command of a prudent officer, to oppose any attempt which might be made to effect a landing or to open a communication with the shore.[3]

On the same day, [*July* 17, 1776,] the *Rose* and one of the tenders ran up the river, the former within three miles of Fort Montgomery; plundered the house of a poor man—taking, among other things, "a "handkerchief full of Salad and a Pig so very poor "that a crow would scarcely deign to eat it"—setting the house on fire, when it was left; and then, returning to the place where the tender had run aground, in the morning, cast her anchor, where, on the following day, the *Phœnix* joined her.[4]

The purposes for which these vessels were sent up the river have never been satisfactorily explained; and where historians have referred to the movement at all, they have generally left the subject imperfectly told. General Howe, in his first despatch on the matter, informed the Home Government that he had "submitted to Admiral Shuldham's consideration the "propriety of sending a naval force up the North-"river, above the Town of New York, with a view to "distress the rebels on that Island, by obstructing "supplies coming down the river, and other good "consequences dependent upon that measure, which "meeting with his approbation, orders are given for "two ships, one of forty and another of twenty guns, "to proceed upon that service, the first favorable op-"portunity; and I flatter myself that these ships, "more than which cannot be spared at present from "the protection of the transports, will prove of suffi-"cient force to support themselves against all at-"tempts of the enemy, from the upper river, and to "answer the purposes for which they are intended,"[5] from which it will be seen that it was a naval movement made for a purely military purpose, originated by the General-in-chief of the Army; and, it is said, unwillingly acquiesced in, by the Admiral.[6]

It was said by General Howe, as we have seen, that the purpose was to cut off the supplies, for the City, which were brought down the river; but he also said, it will be remembered, there were "other good "consequences dependent upon that measure," of the character of which "consequences" he prudently said nothing. If, among those "other good consequences," it was intended to cut off the communication, by water, between New York and Albany and, therefore, between the Army on the northern frontier and the main Army, at the former place, as General Washington suspected,[7] that would have been a well-devised

[1] *Journal of the Convention*, "Tuesday afternoon, 16 July, 1776."

[2] *The Convention to General Washington*, "WHITE PLAINS, July 16, 1776."

Of the last-named excellent suggestion, General Washington subsequently wrote, * * * "but I did not think myself at liberty to "urge or request his" [*Governor Trumbull's*] "interest in forming the "Camp of six thousand men, as the levies, directed by Congress, on the "third of June, to be furnished for the defense of this place, by that "Government, are but little more than one-third come in. At the same "time, the proposition I think a good one, if it could be carried into "execution. In case the enemy should attempt to effect a landing "above Kingsbridge and to cut off the communication between this "City and the country, an Army to hang on their rear would distress "them exceedingly." (*General Washington to the President of the Continental Congress*, "NEW YORK, 19 July, 1776.")

See, also, the General's unusually warm approval of the project, in his letter to the Convention, "HEAD-QUARTERS, NEW YORK, July 19, 1776."

[3] *General George Clinton to General Washington*, "FORT MONTGOMERY, "July 23, 1776."

[4] *General George Clinton to General Washington*, "FORT MONTGOMERY, "July 23, 1776."

The sworn statement of Jacob Hallsted, the owner of the property carried away or destroyed, which is a well-told narrative of some of the evils attendant on every War, may be seen in the *Historical Manuscripts*, etc.: *Miscellaneous Papers*, XXXV., 77.

[5] *General Howe to Lord George Germaine*, "STATEN ISLAND, 8 July, "1776."

[6] The direct authority for this statement has been mislaid; but a confirmation of it may be seen in General Howe's statement, in his despatch to Lord George Germaine, ("STATEN ISLAND, 8 July, 1776,") that no more than the *Phœnix* and *Rose* could have been spared, at that time, from the protection of the transports, even for the important service in which those two ships were employed.

[7] *General Washington to John Augustine Washington*, "NEW-YORK, 22 "July, 1776."

purpose, since the same movement which would have cut the line of communication between the two Armies, would, also, have cut off the supplies intended for the City. It was feared, also, by General Washington,[1] that troops were on board, intended for the seizure and occupation of the passes in the Highlands; and it was also supposed, by the same vigilant commander,[2] that Arms, for the use of those who were inclined to declare for the King, were carried up the river, by these ships and by their tenders.

The success of the expedition, in the purpose for which General Howe said it was principally sent out —to cut off the supplies for the City—was unquestionable; but if that had been the real and principal purpose of the movement, in view of its complete success, the ships would not have been withdrawn after so short a stay—the command of the river, for such a purpose only, would have been just as useful, permanently, as it had been during the short period of their limited stay on the river. There must, therefore, have been "other good consequences dependent on "that measure;" and we are not inclined to admit that any Arms were aboard the ships, for the equipment of Westchester-county Loyalists, nor that any design against the Highland passes was on the programme of their proposed operations—we incline, rather, to the belief that only ostensibly were those ships sent up the river to cut off the supplies; and that, really, they were sent up to sound, not only the river but the inhabitants of the Philipsborough and the Cortlandt Manors, on the eastern bank of the river, and, to some extent, those of Orange-county, below the mountains, on the western bank, as to their disposition to declare themselves favorable to the Royal cause. The vigilance with which the Westchester-shore of the river was generally watched and the extreme backwardness of even those who had been outraged by the County and Town Committees, to abandon their families and their homes, even in retaliation or because of their honorable loyalty to their Sovereign, were so painfully evident, however, that General Howe became convinced that if "the Militia of Westchester-county "could not be depended on," in the revolutionary interest, it was equally untrustworthy, in the interest of the King; that the farmers of Westchester-county were reliable, mainly, in their love of their respective homes; that they desired nothing more than a peaceful occupation of their respective farms; and that he need not expect any military co-operation from them. He learned the lesson, faithfully; and no one who reads what he subsequently wrote,[3] no one who studies what he subsequently did, concerning the alleged loyal element of the country, will fail to trace the spirit of both his words and his actions, back to the teachings of that not unprofitable expedition of the *Phœnix* and the *Rose* into the western waters of Westchester-county.

Whatever may have been the real purposes of the expedition, the eastern shore of the river was so well guarded that no attempt was made to land, in force, for any purpose, on the Westchester-county side of it, nor was there any open communication between the ships and the inhabitants of that County, although it is known that frequent communications were effected, secretly and in the night, with some of the inhabitants of the Cortlandt Manor[4]—it is not pretended by any one, that any Loyalist, from either of the three Counties of Orange, Westchester and Duchess, sought refuge on board of either of the ships. The river

[1] *General Washington to John Augustine Washington*, "NEW-YORK, 22 "July, 1776."

[2] Ibid.

[3] In his published Despatches to the Home Government, while he held the chief command of the Army in America, and in his *Narrative* in a Committee of the House of Commons, relative to his Conduct, etc., especially in his *Observations upon a pamphlet entitled* Letters to a Nobleman, General Howe told the story of his great expection of active co-operation, *in the field*, from those who favored the Royal cause; of the assurances, to that effect, which he received from Governor Tryon and others; of the measures adopted by himself, under the most favorable circumstances; and of the bitter disappointment which he had experienced, in every instance.

As the inhabitants of Staten Island, and those of Queens, Westchester, and Duchess-counties were supposed to have been especially conservative and, consequently, had been most terribly outraged by the dominant faction, it was reasonably supposed, by those who were familiar with the facts, that retaliation if not loyalty would induce these, especially, to declare against those who had oppressed and outraged them; but the peaceful disposition of the farmers of lower Orange and Duchess and Westchester-counties, their simple domestic habits and controlling love of home, and their almost universal contentment with their old-time prosperity and comfort and happiness, were not taken into consideration; and, as the expedition of the *Phœnix* and the *Rose* ascertained and as General Howe subsequently learned, these were more powerful than any other consideration—the farmers referred to, preferred to endure the hardships to which they might be subjected, *at home*, instead of abandoning their homes and wives and children, of throwing themselves into what would have been new and untried associations and methods and experiences, and of being subjected to other hardships, *in the field* or *in garrisons*, as severe, if not more severe, as those from which they would have thus escaped.

General Howe very well said, after experience had taught him the facts, "Much might be said upon the state of loyalty and the principles "of loyalty, in America. *Some* are loyal from principle; *many* from in- "terest; *many* from resentment; *many* wish for peace, but are indifferent which side prevails; and *there are others* who wish success to Great "Britain, from a recollection of the happiness they enjoyed under her "government." (*Observations upon a pamphlet entitled* Letters to a Nobleman, 39.)

Although there may have been individuals among the farmers of Westchester-county who, under this classification, were "loyal from "principle" or from "interest" or from "resentment," there can be very little doubt that the mass of those farmers were loyal, as far as they were loyal in any degree, because of their desire for peace, no matter from whom it might come, and because of their recollection of the happiness they had enjoyed under the Colonial Government.

They practically illustrated the theory of the party of the Opposition to the Home Government, with whom they had been, generally, in harmony—"LET US ALONE."

[4] *General Washington to John Augustine Washington*, "NEW YORK, 22 "July, 1776."

There is not known to have been any communication between the Westchester-county bank of the river and the ships, while the latter remained on their lower anchorage-ground, except those referred to on page 208, ante; but, subsequently, while the ships were off the Cortlandt Manor, their boats as we shall see, were very active, during every night, and it is known the ships were visited by some of the neighboring inhabitants. The guards were less vigilant, in the upper part of the County, than they had been, near Tarrytown.

was carefully sounded, as far as the tenders went;[1] the inhabitants, especially those on the western bank of the river, were widely robbed, and, sometimes, their houses were burned;[2] and the line of communication, between the City and the upper portions of the country, was effectually cut;[3] but, if the purpose had been merely to cut off the supplies, since the supplies of the City which were taken from Westchester-county, were drawn, during the harvest-season, only in very limited quantities and those from only the near-by farmers, possessing only limited means, the ships were anchored too far up the river; and that particular purpose of the expedition must have been, to some extent, defeated, by the mistake of the officer commanding it.

The Militia who were ordered out for the protection of the storehouses and the passes in the Highlands, responded with great promptitude,[4] so much so, indeed, that General Washington was warranted in calling to the main Army some Massachusetts troops who had been sent to that vicinity;[5] and the vessels dropped down and anchored "a little below Ver-"planck's Point," and ceased to make any attempt to effect a landing, anywhere.[6]

On the twenty-sixth of July, the ships were said to have dropped down the river, still further,[7] probably to the mouth of the Croton-river;[8] and it is very evident they fell down to their original station, off Tarrytown, during either the second or third of August.[9]

In the meantime, while the ships were thus alarming nearly every one, by their movements up the river, General Washington, notwithstanding his multitude of other cares, promptly adopted measures for securing the removal of those unwelcome visitors from the waters of the Hudson. Immediately after their successful passage up the river, the General wrote to the Governors of Connecticut and Rhode Island, for the use of some of the galleys which those States had built; and, on the twenty-fourth of July, he wrote to the Convention of New York, telling it what he had done; that he was in expectation, "every "hour," that three or four of those galleys would reach the City of New York; that he had one, already; that if any measures were being taken for attacking the ships, in which these galleys could be usefully employed, to let him know; and that, "if not other-"wise materially engaged," he should be glad to co-operate with them, and to furnish any assistance which the galleys could give.[10] The reply of "the "Secret Committee" of the Convention, to whom this portion of the General's letter was referred, has not been found; but the tenor of it may be seen in the fact that two of the galleys went up the river, on the twenty-eighth of July, and three or four more on the first of August;[11] and that they probably "ran into "shoal water and creeks, whence they could warp out, "at certain times of tide, and annoy the shipping."[12] On the afternoon of the third of August, these galleys—bearing the names, respectively, of *Washington*, *Lady Washington*, *Spitfire*, *Whiting*, *Independence*, *Crane*, and an unnamed whaleboat—boldly attacked the ships, at their anchorage; and as this early naval conflict occurred in the waters of Westchester-county, we make room for the contemporary account of it:

"TARRYTOWN, (Sunday morning,) August 4.

"SIR:

"I have just opportunity to inform you that, "yesterday, at one o'clock, P.M., the galleys attacked "the *Phœnix* and the *Rose*, off Tarrytown.

"The *Lady Washington* fired the first gun on our "side, in answer to one received from the *Phœnix*: "this first shot from us entered the *Phœnix*. The "*Washington*, galley, on board of which the Commo-"dore's flag was hoisted, then came up within grape-"shot of the ships, and singly sustained their whole "fire, for about a quarter of an hour, before any other "of our vessels took a shot from her (the tide wasting "them more than the pilots expected to the eastern "shore; and the *Lady Washington* falling back to

[1] *General Clinton to General Washington*, "FORT MONTGOMERY, July "23, 1776."

[2] *Colonel A. Hawkes Hay to General Washington*, "HAVERSTRAW, July "19, 1776;" *General Clinton to General Washington*, "FORT MONTGOM-"ERY, July 23, 1776;" *Extract from a letter dated at Fort Montgomery*, July 23, 1776, in Force's *American Archives*, V., i., 546.

[3] *Journal of the Convention*, "Thursday morning, July 18, 1776;" *General Washington to John Augustine Washington*, "NEW YORK, 22 July, "1776."

[4] *Pierre Van Cortlandt and Zephaniah Platt, Junr. to the Convention*, "PEEKSKILL, July 18, 1776."

[5] *General Washington to the Convention*, "HEAD-QUARTERS, NEW YORK, "July 19, 1776."

[6] *Pierre Van Cortlandt and Zephaniah Platt, Junr. to the Convention*, "PEEKSKILL, July 22, 1776."

[7] *Memoirs of Major-general Heath*, 50.

[8] *Pierre Van Cortlandt and Zephaniah Platt, Junr. to the Convention*, "HEAD-QUARTERS, MOUTH OF CROTON, Augt. 2, 1776."

On the twenty-sixth of July, Joshua, son of Caleb Ferris—a member of the County Committee, during 1775-6—went on board the *Phœnix*, remaining all night; and Philip Schuyler—who had been in Boston, while the Royal Army had occupied the Town; who had been taken prisoner, by the Americans; and who had been released by reason of personal influence of his friends—Frederic Secore, "one Bailey,"* and Lewis Purdy, "from Croton River," are also known to have gone to the same ship, on that day or subsequently. (*Examinations of Joshua Ferris, Historical Manuscripts*, etc.: *Miscellaneous Papers*, XXXV., 69, 85.)

* On Sunday night, the twenty-eighth of July, because the New England troops had gone away, on the preceding day, leaving the river-line unguarded, the boats from the ships went ashore, "at one Bailey's," near the mouth of Croton-river; "went back, half a mile; and drove off "a pair of oxen, two cows, one calf, one heifer, and eleven sheep: no "doubt had the assistance of some Tories, on shore." (*Pierre Van Cortlandt and Zephaniah Platt, Junr., to the Convention*, "HEAD QUARTERS, "MOUTH OF CROTON, Augt. 2, 1776.")

Was the Bailey, at whose house the landing was thus made, the same Bailey who was seen on board the *Phœnix*, a few days afterwards?

[9] Compare the letter of Pierre Van Cortlandt and Zephaniah Platt, Junr., of the second of August, with the reports of the engagement between the galleys and the ships, off Tarrytown, on the evening of the next day.

[10] *General Washington to the Convention*, "NEW-YORK, July 24, 1776."

[11] *Memoirs of Major-general Heath*, 51.

[12] [Hall's] *History of the Civil War in America*, 186.

"take her station in the line, according to orders) "The *Spitfire* advanced, in a line with the *Washing-* "*ton;* and, with her, behaved well.

"We had as hot a fire as, perhaps, was ever known, "for an hour and a half. The *Washington*, which I "was on board, during the whole engagement, had "the ledgings of her bow-guns knocked away, which "prevented our working them, and was otherwise "considerably damaged, being thirteen times hulled, "had three shot in the waist, many of her oars car-"ried away, etc. *The Lady Washington*, after hulling "the *Phœnix* six times, had her bow, and only, gun, "a thirty-two-pounder, on which we placed much "dependence, split seven inches, and her gun-tackles "and breechings carried away. The *Spitfire* was "hulled, several times, and received one shot between "wind and water, which, not being quickly disrov-"ered, occasioned her making much water. The rest "of the galleys received considerable damage in their "rigging, sails, and oars.[1] Under these circumstances, "our Commodore, Colonel Tupper, thought it pru-"dent to give the signal for our little fleet to with-"draw, after manfully fighting a much superior force, "for two hours.

"Never did men behave with more firm, deter-"mined spirits, than our little crews; one of our tars, "being mortally wounded, cried to his mess-mate, 'I "'am a dying man: revenge my blood, my boys, and "'carry me alongside my gun, that I may die there.' "We were so preserved by a gracious Providence, "that in all our galleys, which consisted of six, we "we had but two men killed and fourteen wounded, "two of which are thought dangerous. We hope to "have another touch at these Pirates, before they "leave our river, which God prosper.

"P. S. The following are the particulars of the "galleys, with their killed and wounded, viz.: the "*Washington*, Captain Hill, four wounded; the *Whit-* "*ing*, McCleave, one killed, four wounded; the *Spit-* "*fire*, Grimes, one killed, three wounded; the *Crane*, "Tinker, one wounded; on board a whaleboat, two "wounded."[2]

It appears that one, Anderson, had proposed a scheme to the Continental Congress for destroying the British fleet, then lying in the harbor of New York, with fire-ships; and he had been officially recommended to General Washington, by the President of the Congress, with a request that the experiment should be made.[3] The General had, accordingly, employed Anderson in constructing two fire-vessels; and, on the eighth of August, they were sent up the river,[4] for the purpose of destroying a portion, at least, of the squadron which seems to have continued to occupy its anchorage, off Tarrytown, although, by some, it is said to have dropped down the river, to the vicinity of the Lower Yonkers. One of these vessels was commanded by Captain Fosdick, the other by

[1] It will be seen that very little was said, in this Report, of the operations of the Connecticut galleys, the *Crane* and the *Whiting*: the following correspondence will remedy that defect:

I.

"NEW-HAVEN, October 14, 1776.

"SIR:

"By Captain Tinker am informed of the misfortune and situation of "the row-galleys sent into the Continental service from this State; and "as circumstances are altered, respecting them, since my last to you, on "the subject of dismissing their crews and arms, must again request your "attention to that matter, that the crew of the *Crane*, Captain Tinker, "who escaped, may be dismissed, and be admitted to return to the em-"ployment of this State; and that if the crews of the other two galleys "can be of no further service to you, they, likewise, may be dismissed; "of one or both, as you see fit, as we can employ them to advantage on "board our armed vessels, fitting out, into which service they are desir-"ous of entering.

"The galleys being employed in the service of the Continent, are es-"teemed to be at the Continental care and risk.

"This State readily submits to your Excellency's directions what is requisite and proper relative to the men and their arms.

"I am, with esteem and respect,

"Sir, your most obedient, humble servant,

"JONTH. TRUMBULL.

"TO HIS EXCELLENCY GENERAL WASHINGTON."

II.

"HEAD-QUARTERS, October 18, 1776.

"SIR:

"The very critical state of our Army and frequent movements of the en-"emy render it almost impossible for the General to write, himself, with-"out neglecting more important duties. He, therefore, directs me to an-"swer your letter of the 14th, and to say that the Captains of the galleys "from your State have misbehaved, invariably, from the first moment they "came, to the time of their departure from hence, about a week ago; "that the accumulation of business and a hope that they would retrieve "their reputation, prevented your having an earlier information of their "behaviour. They are now under the sentence of a Court Martial for "misbehaviour, in the first attack made on the ships in the North River; "and on every other occasion, since, have manifested such want of "spirit and judgment as to be despised by the whole Army. . . .

"I am, Sir, by his Excellency's command,

"Your most obedient, humble servant,

"JOSEPH REED, *Adjutant-general.*"

[2] *The Pennsylvania Journal; and the Weekly Advertiser*, No. 1757, PHILADELPHIA, Wednesday, August 7, 1776.

For other accounts of this early naval action, see an *Extract of a letter from New York*, dated August 4, 1776, in Force's *American Archives*, Fifth Series, i. 751; *General Washington to the President of Congress*, "NEW-YORK, 5 "August, 1776;" *The Pennsylvania Evening Post*, Volume II., No. 241, PHILADELPHIA, Tuesday, August 6, 1776; *The Connecticut Gazette and Universal Intelligencer*, Vol. II., No. 666, NEW-LONDON, Friday, August 16, 1776; [Hall's] *History of the Civil War in America*, i., 186, who said "most of the galleys were run on shore, and taken;" *Memoirs of General Heath*, 51; Ramsay's *History of the American Revolution*, Edit. London, 1791, i., 298, a mere mention; Allen's *History of the American Revolution*, Edit. Baltimore, 1822, i., 429; Wilson's *History of the American Revolution*, Ed. Baltimore, 1843, 157; Force's *American Archives*, V., i., 751; Irving's *Life of Washington*, Edit. New York, 1856, ii., 299.

Not others of the many writers on the American Revolution and General Washington, as far as we have seen them, including Stedman, Murray, Andrews, Lamb, Marshall, Hildreth, Pitkin, Leacraft, Hinman, Lossing, Bancroft, Carrington, Belpath, etc., nor the local historian, Bolton, have paid the slightest attention to it.

We learn from the records of the "Governor and Council, or Committee of War," of Connecticut, that the *Whiting* and the *Crane* were owned by the State of Connecticut, and were, probably, those which were loaned to General Washington; that the *Whiting* was a new vessel, commanded by Captain John McCleave, was manned with fifty men, including her officers, and armed with four cannon, taken from the *Minerva*, eight swivels, and five muskets; and that the *Crane* was also a new vessel, commanded by Captain Jehial Tinker, was manned with fifty men, including her officers, and armed with two Continental nine-pounders, two three-pounders, eight swivels, and ten muskets.

[3] Sparks's *Writings of George Washington*, iv., 19, note.

[4] *Memoirs of General Heath*, 51.

Captain Thomas, both of them volunteers from the Army; and they must have succeeded in passing up the river and in being concealed, without having been seen by the enemy; and no one, ashore, appears to have given the slightest information concerning them.

We are told these vessels were sloops,[1] probably such as ordinarily sailed on the North-river; and that the night of the fourteenth of August was appointed for the attempt to burn the ships; but, from some unexplained cause, without having aroused any suspicion, however, the attempt was not, then, made.[2] Two nights later, that of the sixteenth of August, it was "pretty dark," and the tide was also favorable; and the mischief-laden sloops were unmoored, and allowed to drift with the tide, silently, up the river, toward their proposed victims. The *Rose's* tender is said to have been anchored as a look-out, ahead of the ships;[3] and Captain Thomas, without having been discovered by the enemy, steered his sloop alongside of her; grappled her; and lighted his fires. The flames from the burning vessels afforded light to Captain Fosdick, who, with very great ability, so directed his sloop that she fell alongside of the *Phœnix*, and grappled her, notwithstanding every effort of seamanship, on board the ship, was made to prevent it. With her fires fiercely burning, the sloop continued alongside the *Phœnix*, nearly a quarter of an hour, during which time the latter was also set on fire, in four places; and she was finally saved from total destruction, "almost miraculously," by a sailor who leaped, naked, on board the sloop, and, with an axe, "disengaged the "chain of the grappling which had "linked the two vessels together."[4] It is said,[5] very reasonably, that the lowness of the burning sloop, when alongside of the vastly larger frigate, prevented the more complete ignition of the latter; and that, after the vessels had been separated, the sloop was sunk by her intended victim. We are told,[6] also, that, as soon as she was disentangled from the burning sloop, "the *Phœnix* either cut "or slipped her cable; let fall her foresail; wore "around; and stood up the river; being immediately veiled from the spectators by the darkness of "the night;" that "the *Rose* and the other two "tenders remained at their moorings, although it was "said that one of the tenders was deserted by her "crew, for a time;" that the tender which was grappled by Captain Thomas was burned to the water's edge and was towed to the shore, by the Americans,[7] by whom one iron six-pound gun, two three-pounders, one two-pounder, ten swivels, a caboose and apron, some gun-barrels, cutlasses, grapplings, chains, etc., were taken from the wreck; and that the gallant crews of the fireships sustained neither loss nor injury, except in the instance of one man, who, in setting fire to his vessel, was considerably burned in his face, hands, etc., and in that of Captain Thomas, who, it was feared, perished in the attempt to fasten his vessel to the tender which it destroyed or in making his escape, by swimming, as he was not subsequently heard of. As General Washington stated in the letter from which we derive the information, when writing of him, "his bravery entitled him to a "better fate."[8]

Notwithstanding the bravery and skill of those who conducted the firevessels and the considerable success which attended their efforts, it is said that the advantages gained would have been largely increased had the galleys more actively co-operated with them; and there was evidently some dissatisfaction displayed, because of that nautical backwardness;[9] but these

THE AMERICAN FIRESHIPS.

[1] *Memoirs of General Heath*, 51.

[2] Ibid.

[3] [Hall's] *History of the Civil War in America*, i., 186.

[4] We have taken this minute description of the assault on the enemy's ships from Captain Hall's *History of the Civil War in America*, i., 186, 187, because it is so clearly stated, and because it is the work of an officer of the Royal Army, and, therefore, is not likely to have been overstated.

[5] Gordon's *History of the American Revolution*, ii., 366.

[6] *Memoirs of General Heath*, 54.

[7] Lieutenant Loudon, of Colonel Nicoll's Regiment, and two privates of his Company, (*General Heath to General Washington*, "KING'S BRIDGE, "August 20, 1776.")

[8] *General Washington to Governor Trumbull*, "NEW-YORK, August 18, "1776."

[9] Ibid.

General Heath reported to General Washington, on the morning after the attack, that the galleys *Lady Washington* and *Independence* had behaved well, in their co-operation with the firevessels, while the other galleys were inactive; and the Commander-in-chief answered, on the same day, expressing his pleasure in hearing of the good behavior of those who had participated in the adventure, and instructing General Heath to "inquire into the cause of the inactivity of the other galleys, "and inform him thereof."—(*Richard Varick, Jun. A.D.C. to General Heath*, "HEAD-QUARTERS, August 17, 1776.")

In Adjutant-general's Reed's reply to Governor Trumbull's letter concerning the Connecticut galleys, after having recited the notorious mis-

repeated attacks and the want of intercourse with the fleet and the perils to which they were exposed, prompted the commanders of the ships, on the eighteenth of August, less than forty-eight hours after the last attack had been made on them, to take advantage of a strong easterly wind and a very rainy morning, to run down the river, past the fortifications thrown up by the Americans, and to join the main body of the fleet, off Staten Island, a feat which was successfully accomplished, without any considerable damage, "the air resounding with acclamations from the "fleet, re-echoed by the Army encamped on the "heights above,"[1] as they came to the anchorage.

During the period occupied in this early naval demonstration, so interesting to those of Westchester-county who lived near the line of the Hudson-river, neither of the great opposing powers, in the City of New York and on Long Island, on the one side, and on and around Staten Island, on the other, did any thing else than to strengthen their respective forces and prepare for the rapidly approaching contest. General Washington continued to strengthen his defences, both in the City of New York and on Long Island; but the backwardness of the distant States, in sending reinforcements to the Army, not only caused a constant anxiety, at Head-quarters, but an alarm which extended beyond the lines of the Camp.[2]

behavior of the crews of all of them, "in the first attack made on the "ships in the North River," for which they had been tried and condemned by a Continental Court-martial, that officer, writing "by his Ex-"cellency's commands," (*vide page* 211, *ante*) said of the subsequent operation of those galleys, "In the late affair, Captain McCleave must be ex-"cepted from the general censure, as he managed with prudence and "propriety. But Captain Tinker, with the wind at South, and on the "tide of flood" [*flood of tide?*] "when the ships could move, left his vessel, "though stationed as a guard, to go up to King's Bridge, after some "clothes, as he pretends. The consequence was, that, in the hurry and "confusion, and long before they were in danger, they left the gal-"ley aground, though they might have burned or bilged her. The enemy "took possession of her, in half an hour; and she, with the other, left "under the like circumstances, will probably prove the most formidable "force they can have, to oppose us, on the river. There was a place of "safety provided for the other galleys, which they might have got into, "as well as McCleave; but they passed it, in their hurry." (*General Washington, through the Adjutant-general, to Governor Trumbull*, "HEAD-"QUARTERS, October 18, 1776.")

[1] [Hall's] *History of the Civil War in America*, i., 187.

For other accounts of this daring feat, in attempting to destroy these ships, and of the subsequent escape of the latter, see *General Heath to General Washington*, "KING'S BRIDGE, 17 August, 1776;" *General Washington to the President of Congress*, "NEW-YORK, August 17, 1776;" *the same to Governor Trumbull*, "NEW YORK, August 18, 1776;" *General Heath to General Washington*, "KING'S BRIDGE, 18 August, 1776;" *Examination of Jonathan Woodman and two others, deserters, enclosed by General Mercer to General Washington*, "NEWARK, August 19, 1776;" *Extract from a letter dated* "NEW YORK, August 19, 1776," published in Force's *American Archives*, Fifth Series, i., 1066; *General Heath to General Washington*, "KING'S BRIDGE, August 20, 1776;" *The Pennsylvania Evening Post*, Vol. II., No. 247, PHILADELPHIA, Tuesday, August 20, 1776; *The Pennsylvania Journal*, No. 1759, PHILADELPHIA, Wednesday, August 21, 1776; *The Connecticut Gazette and Universal Intelligencer*, Vol. II., No. 167, NEW LONDON, Friday, August 23, 1776; *Memoirs of General Heath*, 53-55; Gordon's *History of the American Revolution*, ii., 305; Force's *American Archives*, V., i., 983; Irving's *Life of George Washington*, ii., 306, 307; etc.

What purports to have been copied from a contemporary drawing of the brilliant scene, made by Sir James Wallace, who had command of the *Rose*, on the occasion now under notice, may be seen in *The Manual of the Corporation of the City of New York for* 1861, opposite page 672. It is understood to have been copied from the original drawing, in the British Museum; and it has been re-produced, in perfect *facsimile*, but reduced in size, for the illustration of this article. (*Vide page* 215, *ante*.)

What the local historian of Westchester-county possibly intended for a description of this daring attempt to destroy the ships, was in these words, taken from his description of the property of the late Elijah Rich, near Yonkers: "Here, in 1777, a memorable engagement took "place between the two British frigates, the *Rose* and the *Phœnix*, which "lay off at anchor, and the gun-boats of the patriots which sallied out "of the harbor of Yonkers, having in tow a large tender filled with "combustibles, intending to run it alongside of the frigates. The crews, "however, kept it off, by means of spars; and a heavy fire of grape and "canister compelled the gun-boats and their brave crews to seek shelter "in the mouth of the Saw Mill. The year previous," he continued, "General Heath had been requested by the person in command of the "fireships, to be a spectator of the burning of these vessels," quoting, in full, what General Heath, in his *Memoirs*, under the date of the sixteenth of August, 1776, had said of the attempt to destroy these ships, which is the subject of the narrative, in the text. (*History of Westchester-county*, original edition, ii., 459, 460; *the same*, second edition, ii., 627, 628.)

As it is more than probable that the ships, when they were attacked, were off Tarrytown, instead of below Yonkers; as Yonkers, in 1777, was within the British lines, and so could not have afforded a rendezvous, in the Saw-Mill-river, for American gun-boats and fireships, during that year; as the *Phœnix* and the *Rose* had dropped down to the anchorage of the Royal Fleet, off Staten Island, on the eighteenth of August, 1776, two days after the engagement described in the text; and as the authority whom he quoted, in full, described the engagement, of which he was an eye-witness, as having taken place on the sixteenth of August, 1776, it will be evident to the reader that the historian of Westchester-county, as well as his posthumous Editor, blundered.

[2] In order that the reader may understand the gravity of the subject, and be the better prepared for the recital of the narrative of those stirring events which occurred within the succeeding month, we make room for the following:

"It gives us great pain to inform you that the aid received from our "sister States is very inadequate to our expectations, none of them hav-"ing yet completed the levies directed by Congress, which leaves us "reason to fear that, instead of using every means that human wisdom "dictates, for ensuring success, we shall, (with inferior numbers,) on "the doubtful issue of a single battle, hazard the glorious cause for "which we have hitherto struggled." (*The Convention of New York to the Delegation from New York in the Continental Congress*, "HARLEM, 7th Au-"gust, 1776, A. M.")

"It is our great misfortune that, at this important crisis, this State is "unable to make those exertions which the cause of America requires. "From the disaffection of some among us; from the want of arms; "from the exposed situation of Long Island and our frontiers; from the "possession of one County by the enemy; and from the probability of "our being called upon to reinforce the northern Army, we are unable "to add much strength to your Excellency's command, being, by the "several reasons above-mentioned, deprived of the assistance of nine "Counties out of *fourteen* which compose this State. Nothwithstanding "all these difficulties, we are determined to combat every obstacle and "to strain every nerve in defense of the rights and liberties of America, "which we conceive to be most materially interested in the safety of this "State. By our Resolutions for ordering the several drafts made in the "Counties of Suffolk, Queens, Kings, Westchester, Duchess, Ulster, and "Orange, to the environs of New York, we hope, in about six days, to "add near three thousand men to your Army.

"We lament, exceedingly, that we should have occasion to complain "of the languid efforts which the neighbouring States have made for "our assistance. From the zeal they professed for the public cause; "from the vicinity of some of them to this invaded country; and from "the dangerous situation in which Connecticut, Massachusetts, Penn-"sylvania, and Jersey must be in, should the enemy succeed in their "designs against this State, we expected the most strenuous and exp-"editious exertions. How great our concern [*is*] at finding so considera-"ble a deficiency in the establishment of this Army, your Excellency "may easily judge from the feelings of a patriotic bosom, on the im-"portance of the cause and the dangers to which it is, by these means, "exposed.

"We flatter ourselves, however, that this supineness will not be of

General Howe, on the contrary, had been strengthened, on the twelfth of July, by the arrival of his brother, Admiral Lord Howe, with the long expected reinforcements for the Royal Army;[1] and he brought, also, a Commission from the King, appointing his brother, General Howe, and himself[2] to be Commissioners for granting pardons to those of the Americans who should ask for the clemency of the Sovereign.[3] On the twelfth of August, the two fleets, under the convoy, respectively, of Commodore Hotham and the *Repulse*, met off Sandy-hook, and entered the harbor together, bringing another heavy reinforcement to the Royal Army, as well as the much needed Camp-equipage;[4] two days later, [*August* 14, 1776,] Sir Peter Parker reached Staten Island, with the remains of the expedition which had been sent to Virginia and the Carolinas;[5] and, at the same time, Lord Dunmore, "with the refugees and blackamoors "from Virginia,"[6] and Lord William Campbell, recently Governor of South Carolina, also joined General Howe.[7] Although General Howe made no mention of them, in his despatches to Lord George Germaine, it is said the Royal Army was strengthened, also, about the same time, by the accession of "several Regiments from Florida and the West In-"dies;"[8] and, although about one half the German troops had not arrived—they were on the ocean, but were not immediately expected—the strength and discipline and appointments and spirits of the Army were greatly superior to those of the American Army, and reasonably promised greater success, in the field.

The Convention of the State, during that period of suspense, removed back from the White Plains to Harlem, occupying the old Church-building of the Reformed Dutch Church;[9] and, nearer to the scene of the expected troubles, it provided for the protection of the Hudson-river and Long Island Sound, where the enemy was expected to make a landing, in force, by ordering the entire Militia of Westchester-county to appear, with five days' provisions, to take possession of such points, on the river and Sound, as General Morris should regard as most exposed to the enemy; to remain in service during ten days; to receive Continental pay and subsistence; and that each man who should not have arms should bring with him a shovel, spade, or pickaxe, or a scythe straightened and fixed on a pole[10]—the latter, not easily to

"any duration; and that the Continental Congress will devise means of "affording the most expeditious and effectual assistance to preserve a "State, the loss of which, from its geographical situation and the politi-"cal character of too many of its inhabitants, would be almost fatal to "the cause of American liberty." (*The Convention of New York to General Washington*, "HARLEM, Augt. 9, 1776.")

"I am extremely concerned that the quotas of men to be furnished by "the neighboring States have proved so deficient. The busy season "and harvest, to which it has been ascribed, being now over, in a great "degree, I flatter myself, from the zeal they have heretofore manifested, "they will afford every possible assistance. They are well apprised of "the importance of this State, in the present contest, and the necessity "of maintaining it against the attempts of the enemy." (*General Washington to the Convention*, "NEW-YORK, August 11, 1776.")

How ill-founded General Washington's faith in the sincerity of the other States was, beyond the limits of their respective individual interests, has been duly recorded in history, is well-known to every intelligent reader, and need not be repeated, in this place.

[1] *General Washington to General Schuyler*, "NEW YORK, 15 July, 1776;" *The Annual Register for* 1776: *History of Europe*,* 167; etc.

Stedman, (*History of the American War*, i., 191,) said the Admiral and his command arrived at Sandy-hook, on the *first* of July; but his error will be evident to every one.

[2] As the remarkable influence which the General and the Admiral possessed over the King, even under the most adverse circumstances, has been frequently noticed and very rarely explained, a passing notice of the reason for that influence may not be unwelcome to the reader.

de Lancey, in his *Notes* on Jones's *History of New-York during the Revolutionary War*, (i., 722,) has partly "let the cat out of the bag," by saying they "were sons of Emanuel Scrope Howe, second Viscount "Howe, by Mary Sophia, an illegitimate daughter of George I., by his "mistress, the Hanoverian Baroness Kilmansegge, and, consequently, "in point of fact, first cousins once removed of George III." But our friend appears to have gone a little astray, since George III. was the great-grandson of George I.; and the children of a daughter of the latter could hardly have been "first cousins once removed" of the former. Besides, if our memory serves us correctly, the mother of the Howes, whomsoever she may have been, was a paramour of Frederic Lewis, son of George II., and father of George III., even after her convenient marriage with Viscount Howe; and the very distinctive features and the peculiar physical ailments of the two brothers, which they shared with the King, very clearly indicated whose offspring they were, although they were born in wedlock and were, therefore, nominally, Howes. They were, in fact, half brothers of the King.

[3] The extent of the authority of the brothers, Admiral and General Howe, as Commissioners for the restoration of Peace, in America, has been so variously stated, that the careful reader will do well to refer to their Commission, which may be found in a most singular connection with a mass of papers concerning the Expedition commanded by General Burgoyne, which appear to have been laid before the House of Commons, early in 1778. (Almon's *Parliamentary Register*, London: 1778, viii., 308–312.)

When Lord North, closely pinned in debate, declared that "taxation "was not to be given up: it was to be enforced: but whether at present "or hereafter was a point of policy which the Commissioners would "learn, on the spot, by *sounding* the people upon the spot," there was point as well as wit in what Charles James Fox said, in reply: "Accord-"ing to the noble Lord's explanation, Lord Howe and his brother are "to be sent out as *spies*, not as Commissioners, and if they cannot get on "shore, they are to *sound* upon the coasts." (*Debates in the House of Commons*, May 22, 1776: Almon's *Parliamentary Register*, iv., 126.)

[4] *General Howe to Lord George Germaine*, "STATEN ISLAND, 15 Au-"gust, 1776;" *Annual Register for* 1776: *History of Europe*,* 169; *Memoirs of General Heath*, 53; Gordon's *History of the American Revolution*, ii., 304, 305.

[5] *General Howe to Lord George Germaine*, "STATEN ISLAND, 15 August, "1776;" *Governor Tryon to the same*, "SHIP DUCHESS OF GORDON, OFF "STATEN ISLAND, August 14, 1776," postscript, dated "August 15, "1776;" Gordon's *History of the American Revolution*, ii., 306; etc.

[6] Jones's *History of New York during the Revolutionary War*, i., 103.

[7] *General Howe to Lord George Germaine*, "STATEN ISLAND, 15th "August, 1776."

[8] *Annual Register for* 1776: *History of Europe*, 169; Gordon's *History of the American Revolution*, ii., 306.

[9] That old Church-edifice occupied the Church lot, on the South side of the Great Way, or Church-lane, not far from the Harlem-river. As the Streets and Avenues now run, it was inside of the block bounded by the First and Second-avenues and One hundred and twenty-fourth and One hundred and twenty-fifth-streets, near the present intersection of the First-avenue and One hundred and twenty-fourth-street, as it has been described to us by our friend, James Biker, Esq., of Waverly, New York, the distinguished historian of Harlem, etc.

The features of the old building may be seen in the *View of Harlem from Morrisania*, copied from the original drawing, in the British Museum; and reproduced in the *Manual of the Corporation of the City of New York for* 1863, opposite page 610; and, again, on page 218 of this work, for the illustration of this article.

[10] *Journal of the Convention*, "Die Sabbati, 4 P.M., Augt. 10, 1776."

be done, as any Westchester-county farmer could have told those Deputies by whom this order was made. As we have elsewhere stated,[1] King's-county "determined not to oppose the enemy," although the latter had not made any attempt to occupy it; and the Convention, it will be remembered, made some rash movements toward crowding all who lived within that County into still greater acts of hostility against the Americans, instead of inspiriting them and securing their continued fealty to the State of which they were members. It provided for the removal of all which remained, of those Cannon which had been brought from the City and laid on the roadsides of the County of Westchester—those which had been spiked and unspiked, guarded and left unguarded, at such heavy cost, some months previously[2]—and General Clinton was requested to have carriages made for such of those guns as he should consider necessary for the defence of the works to the northward of King's Bridge.[3] At the suggestion of General Washington,[4] measures were taken for the removal of the women, children, and infirm persons, in the City of New York, to places of greater safety;[5] for obstructing the navigation, in both the Hudson and the East-rivers, as well as in Buttermilk-channel, the latter separating Governor's-island from Long Island;[6] providing for the temporary support of those who should be driven from their homes, by the enemy;[7] transferring the disposition of those whom it had cast into prison, because of "suspicions" which somebody had entertained concerning them, to the several County Committees, but in a tone of mildness which was remarkably unusual;[8] and, in other ways, endeavoring to serve the cause of the country—one of the most remarkable of the multitude of subjects which, at that time, crowded themselves before the Convention, for its consideration, was a letter from John Sleght, Chairman of the Committee of Kingston, "stating "that the *women* surround the Committee-chamber, "and say, if they cannot have *Tea*, their husbands "and sons shall fight no more."[9]

At length, every preparation for service in the field having been made, on Thursday, the twenty-second of August, the Campaign was opened. Had Lord Howe been despatched, with the heavy reinforcements which he brought, directly to New York instead of to Halifax—and, since it was known, in England, that New York would be the base of all the operations of the Campaign, there was no other reason than the bad judgment of those, in England, who controlled the movements of the troops, that he was not thus sent—the Campaign could have been opened several weeks earlier, when General Washington was much less prepared to receive an enemy, and, therefore, when a complete success in the suppression of the Rebellion was very much more promising; but that Almighty power which controlled all things, had other purposes; and the cause of America was promoted by that remarkable blunder among those who opposed it.

On the morning of Thursday, the twenty-second of August, as we have said, the active operations of the

"VIEW OF HARLAEM FROM MORISANIA IN THE PROVINCE OF NEW YORK, SEPTEMR, 1765."

[Copied from the original in the British Museum for George H. Moore by Richard Sims.]

[1] Vide page 203, ante.

[2] Vide pages 146-148, ante.

[3] *Journal of the Convention*, "Die Veneris, 9 ho., A.M., August 16, 1776."

[4] *General Washington to the Convention*, "HEAD-QUARTERS, NEW-YORK, "Aug. 17, 1776."

[5] *Journal of the Convention*, "Die Sabbati, 9 ho., A.M., Augt. 17, "1776;" *the same*, "Die Veneris, 3 ho., P.M., Augt. 23, 1776;" *the same*, "Monday morning, Augt. 26, 1776;" etc.

[6] *Journal of the Convention*, "Die Veneris, 9 ho., A.M., August 16, 1776;" *the same*, "Die Sabbati, 9 ho., A.M., Augt. 17, 1776;" *Journal of the Committee of Safety*, "Die Lunæ, 9 ho., A.M., Augt. 19, 1776;" *Journal of the Convention*, "Die Sabbati, 4 ho., P.M., Augt. 24, 1776;" etc.

[7] *Journal of the Convention*, "Die Solis, 8 ho., A.M., Augt. 25, 1776."

[8] *Journal of the Convention*, "Monday morning, Augt. 26, 1776."

[9] *Journal of the Convention*, "Monday morning, Augt. 26, 1776."

It may be proper for us to say that the Chairman's letter was referred to the Deputation from Ulster county; and that, a few weeks subsequently, tired of waiting for the Tea, "mobs, from different parts "of the country," went to Kingston; broke open the buildings which contained it; and, undoubtedly, helped themselves and their mothers and sisters and wives and daughters to what was then officially called "that detestable article called TEA."

Royal Army were commenced by the movement of the British Grenadiers and Light Infantry and the Hessians, or rather the German, Grenadiers, Light Infantry, and Chasseurs—the last-named commanded by the Count Donop—the whole numbering "not less "than four thousand men,"[1] of the *élite* of the Army, the whole commanded by General Sir Henry Clinton, to Gravesend Bay, near Coney-island, where, under the fire of three frigates and two bombketches,[2] the naval portion of the movement having been commanded by Commodore Hotham, the entire detachment, with forty pieces of artillery, were landed, in two hours and a half, without meeting the slightest opposition from the Americans. This Division of the Royal Army having met with no resistance, the remainder of the Army and of the artillery—except two Brigades of Germans, under General de Heister, and another Brigade of Germans, a detachment of the Fourteenth Infantry, from Virginia, some convalescents and some recruits, all of them commanded by Lieutenant-colonel Dalrymple, which were left for the protection of Staten Island—were also landed on Long Island, during the morning.[3]

The purposes of this work do not require us to follow the immediately subsequent operations of the two Armies; and the general knowledge which prevails concerning the disastrous "Battle of Long Island," made more disastrous by reason of "the obstinate, "self-conceited, inefficiency," if not by the criminal disobedience and neglect of General Israel Putnam; concerning the remarkable retreat of the American Army, from Long Island, made more remarkable and successful through the nautical skill of Colonel John Glover and his Regiment of Marblehead fishermen; concerning the successful occupation of the City of New York, by the Royal Army, made more successful by reason of the arrant cowardice of those who had been posted at Kip's-bay, for the purpose of obstructing any attempt which the enemy should make to effect a landing at that place, as well as by reason of the greater cowardice of the Brigade of Massachusetts troops, commanded by General Fellows, and that of the Brigade of Connecticut troops, commanded by General Parsons, both of them, eight Regiments, in all, sent for the support of the small shore-guard; concerning the successful evacuation of the City of New York, by the American Army, made more successful by the tact and hospitality of Mary Lindley Murray and by the soldierly ability and the knowledge of the ground, of Aaron Burr; concerning the brilliant skirmish on Harlem Heights, made more brilliant by the daring bravery of Major Leitch, of Virginia, and that of Colonel Thomas Knolton, of Connecticut; and concerning the apparent inactivity, in both the Armies, which prevailed, during several succeeding weeks,—the general knowledge which prevails, concerning all these subjects, renders anything else than a mere reference to them, unnecessary. But, nevertheless, there were some minor operations, of both parties, during that period, which may well receive passing notices.

Early on the morning of the twenty-seventh of August, two ships and a brig anchored a little above Throgg's-neck; and before the troops whom General Heath had sent for the purposes of protecting the neighboring property, could reach the shore, several barges had gone ashore, on City-island; killed several cattle;[4] and carried away the dead animals and one of the inhabitants. The troops managed to secure the remainder of the cattle which were on the island.[5]

As there was an evident intention, on the part of the enemy, to occupy one or more positions, on New York-island or within Westchester-county or both, General Heath, who commanded all the Continental troops at Kingsbridge and in the last-mentioned County, with that faithful attention to his duties which so generally characterized him, ordered a chain of vedettes and other sentries to be maintained at Morrisania, Hunt's-point, Throgg's-neck, and other points, on the Sound, in order that the movements of the enemy, had he inclined to move to those neighborhoods, or to either of them, might be promptly made known to him.[6] The usefulness of that wise precaution will be seen, hereafter.

For the purpose of cutting the line of communication of the City of New York, through the Sound, with the sea—the way to the ocean, by way of the Narrows, having been already occupied by him—the enemy very judiciously occupied Barren-island, belonging to Westchester-county, Montresor's—now Randall's—island, and what is now known as Ward's-island—the latter two belonging to the County of New York, all of which, to some extent, at least, commanded the passage to and through the Sound;[7] and, on the tenth and eleventh of September, a considerable body of troops was landed on Montresor's-island,[8] which entirely com-

[1] [Hall's] *History of the Civil War in America*, i., 188.

See, also, Stedman's *History of the American War*, i., 193.

[2] [Hall's] *History of the Civil War in America*, i., 188; Stedman's *History of the American War*, i., 193.

[3] *General Howe to Lord George Germaine*, "NEWTOWN, LONG ISLAND, "3 Sept., 1776;" *General Washington to General Heath*, "HEAD-QUARTERS, "NEW-YORK, 23 August, 1776;" *the same to the President of the Congress*, "NEW-YORK, August 23, 1776;" [Hall's] *History of the Civil War in America*, i., 188; *Memoirs of General Heath*, 55; Stedman's *History of the American War*, i., 193; Gordon's *History of the American Revolution*, ii., 396; etc.

[4] Colonel Joseph Drake, in his letter to the Convention, dated "NEW-"ROCHELL, Augt. 28, 1776," said "they have not been able to *plunder* "*much*; they got from Mineford's-island" [*near City-island*,] "4 horned "cattle and some poultry, which is all we have been able to learn they "have plundered." In his *Memoirs*, (page 56,) General Heath said "the "enemy carried off one man and 11 cattle."

[5] *Memoirs of General Heath*, 55, 56; *Colonel Joseph Drake to General Morris*, "NEW ROCHEL, Augt. 27, 1776"—*Historical Manuscripts*, etc: *Miscellaneous Papers*, xxxvi., 439.

[6] *Memoirs of General Heath*, 59.

[7] Stedman's *History of the American War*, i., 199.

[8] *Memoirs of General Heath*, 59.

manded the Manor-house—all there was, at that time, of Morrisania, except the small farmhouses of the manorial tenantry, which were scattered over the surrounding country. The channel which separated Morrisania, in Westchester-county, from Montresor's-island, in the City of New York, being quite narrow, and a heavy picket of four hundred and fifty mounted men having been constantly maintained at Morrisania, the sentries of the respective forces, posted within half-gunshot distance, sometimes fired at each other, in violation of the inconsistent usages of War; and General Heath has recorded some interesting instances of both the friendly and the unfriendly correspondence of these very important minor outposts.[1] But a couple deserters from a man-of-war which was anchored off the island, conveyed such information to General Heath as led him to suppose that the entire force which occupied that island could be easily captured; and, having submitted the subject to the consideration of the General Officers of his Division and to General Washington, and, having received the approval of all, he proceeded to make the attempt. Two hundred and forty men were detached for that purpose; and the command of the expedition was given to Lieutenant-colonel Michael Jackson and Major Logan and Major Hatfield, the latter of Westchester-county. They were to embark, at the new Bridge over the Harlem-river, on board of three large floats; to be covered by a fourth float, similar to the others and carrying a detachment of Artillery, with a light three-pounder gun; to fall down the Harlem-river, with the ebb, during the night, to Morrisania; and the calculation was so made that, at daybreak, the young flood should be so much made, at the island, as to cover the flats, at the proposed place of landing, sufficiently for the floats to leave Morrisania, and be run ashore. The various sentries, on the line of the Harlem-river, were said to have been informed of the character of the movement, and instructed to permit the expedition to pass down the river, without challenging it; and every promise of a successful result was heard from all who were to be concerned in it or who knew of the proposed plan of operations. Notwithstanding one of the sentries had not been told of the expedition or had misunderstood the Order which had been given to him, and had resolutely disregarded the entreaties for silence which had been made, and had discharged his musket, giving an alarm, the enemy does not appear to have been disturbed; and the three floats ran up to the place appointed for the landing, without serious opposition, and at the appointed time. But, there, a new and entirely unlooked-for obstruction was encountered. The orders were that the float which contained the three commanding Officers should run ashore, between the other two; that the two Majors should jump ashore, one to the right and the other to the left, and take command of the men who were on those two outside floats, respectively, while Lieutenant-colonel Jackson should retain the command of those who were on the central float; and that the three parties should act in concert. The Officers and those who were on the central float sprang ashore, as they were expected; received and repulsed a charge which the enemy's guard made on them; but failed to receive the slightest support from those who were on the other two floats, who, instead of landing, sullenly "lay upon their oars." The enemy seeing that disaffection, rallied, and returned to the charge, with great spirit; and the Americans, those from the central float, finding themselves deserted, returned to their own float, with heavy loss; and the entire expedition withdrew from the island—whether the fourth float, on which were the Artillery and which was intended as a covering party, performed any service, is not now known, as nothing whatever has been said of it, in the narrative of the encounter and retreat. It is said that Lieutenant-colonel Jackson received a musket-ball in his leg; that Major Thomas Henley, one of the Aides-de-camp of General Heath, who had insisted on going out with the expedition, as a Volunteer, was shot through his heart, as he was getting into the float; that Major Hatfield was missing; and that the Americans lost, in killed, wounded, and missing, fourteen men.[2]

There was a wide-spread sorrow expressed for the death of Major Henley, who appears to have been a general favorite; and the cowardice of those who held back their support was as widely reprobated; but, in the prevailing temper of that period, although the delinquents were arrested and tried by Court-martial, nothing appears to have been done with them, beyond the cashiering of one of the Captains.[3]

[1] *Memoirs of General Heath*, 62, 63.

[2] The most complete account of this disastrous expedition is that of General Heath, in his *Memoirs*, 63–66; but the *Orders* which were given to Lieutenant-colonel Jackson by General Heath, "KING'S BRIDGE, "September 22, 1776;" David How's *Diary*, Edit. Morrisania, 1865, September 22, 1776; *General Orders*, "HEAD-QUARTERS, HARLEM-"HEIGHTS, September 24, 1776;" *Lieutenant-colonel Tench Tilghman to William Duer*, "HEAD-QUARTERS, HARLEM-HEIGHTS, September 25, 1776;" *Extract of a letter from an Officer, at* HARLEM, dated September 25, 1776, in Force's *American Archives*, Fifth Series, ii., 524; *Extract from a letter from Mount Washington*, dated September 26, 1776; *John Adams to Mrs. Adams*, "PHILADELPHIA, October 8, 1776;" Gordon's *History of the American Revolution*, ii., 235—who says there were *fire* boats, one of which was sunk by the fire of the *Brune*, frigate—etc., may be usefully consulted concerning it.

[3] *General Orders*, HEAD-QUARTERS, HARLEM-HEIGHTS, September 29, 1776; *Proceedings of a General Court martial of the Line, held on the Heights of Harlem, by order of His Excellency George Washington, Esq., General and Commander-in-chief of the Forces of the United States of America, for the trial of the Captains Wisner and Scott, in the service of said States, September 30, 1776*; *Adjutant-general Reed to General Heath*, "HEAD-QUARTERS, Oct. 5, 1776;" *the members of the General Court martial to Adjutant-general Reed*, "CAMP NEAR HEAD-QUARTERS, October "6, 1776;" *Memoirs of General Heath*, 66.

The atrocities of both Officers and Privates of the American Army and the inadequacy of the punishments, therefor, to which the delinquents were then subjected, may be seen in multitudes of instances, throughout the contemporary publications; but the letter of General Washington, written to the President of the Continental Congress, "HEIGHTS

The apparent inactivity of the two opposing Armies, during several weeks after the occupation of the City of New York, was not understood, even by the Congress, and created some uneasiness;[1] but both were actively employed, the Royal Army in throwing up a line of defences, on the high grounds overlooking the Harlem-plains, from the South, in order to protect the City from an attack from the landside, when the main Army should be put in motion, for other operations;[2] and the American Army in not only throwing up defences on the high grounds overlooking the Harlem-plains, from the North, in order to protect itself from any attack which might be made on it, in that remarkably strong position,[3] but in throwing up defensive works, in its rear and at distant points, in order to guard against any surprise, by the enemy, of either of those points.[4]

During that long interval of apparent inactivity in the two Armies, the Convention of New York and its Committee of Safety were not idle nor inattentive to the interests of the country. It provided for the removal of the women, children, and infirm, and that of the poor, from the City of New York, in some instances into Westchester-county;[5] and the care of the public records also received its careful attention.[6] When the enemy's shipping threatened the shores of Suffolk, it appealed for help from Connecticut, in view of its own inability to afford protection;[7] when the Army retreated from Long Island, wisely foreseeing that the Horses, Cattle, Hogs, and Sheep, within the County of New York and the lower portions of Westchester-county, would become exposed to the depredations of the enemy, the Committee of Safety ordered them to be, forthwith, driven into the interior parts of the State, and requested General Washington to make that order public, and to give all possible assistance in carrying it into execution;[8] and, subsequently, when the purpose of the enemy to occupy Westchester-county had become more evident, Stephen Ward was appointed a Commissary "to purchase "all the Cattle fit for the use of the Army, within "that County, and to drive them down to the Army, "at King's Bridge, as fast as they may be wanted; "PROVIDED, that so much shall be left as is absolutely necessary for the support of the families from "whom the same shall be taken."[9] At the same time, orders were given by the Committee of Safety, "that if any person shall refuse to part with his "Cattle, at a reasonable price, the Commissary be "directed to drive them down to the Army, and return to the owner the money for which they were "sold, after deducting the contingent charge;" "that "all the Hides of the Cattle so driven and killed, be "carefully preserved and sent to some safe place, on "the North side of the Highlands, where, being appraised by persons hereafter to be named for that "purpose, they shall be paid for, by the State;" "that Gil. Budd Horton, Alexander Hunt, James "Varian, and Joseph Youngs be appointed Commissioners to drive all the Horses, Hogs, Sheep, and "Cattle, from those parts of the County of Westchester which lay upon the Sound or the Hudson's-river, "and which are any way exposed to the enemy, and "to billet them out upon the farms that lay in the "interior part of the County, till the same can be "otherwise disposed of; and that a reasonable compensation be allowed them, for their trouble;" "that the farmers in the County of Westchester immediately thresh out all their Grain, as the Straw "will be absolutely necessary for the use of the Army, "and as those who do not comply with this Resolution will be in danger of having their Straw taken "for the use of the Army, even though the same "should not be threshed;" "that His Excellency "General Washington be empowered to order any "Straw in the County of Westchester to be taken for "the use of the Army, paying to the owners a reasonable compensation therefor;" "that the Chairman "or Deputy Chairman of the County of Westchester, "for the time being, on application from the Commissary-general, be empowered to take so much of the "Grain, in the County of Westchester, as shall be "necessary for the use of the Army, allowing to the "owners thereof the now current price, and paying "them upon the delivery, PROVIDED, always, that "so much shall be left in the hands of the owners as "will be sufficient to support their families for nine "months, and to perfect the fattening of such Hogs "as may, now, be actually put up, for that purpose;" "that His Excellency General Washington, in case "that the Cattle, Hogs, Sheep, Horses, or Hay, in the "County of Westchester, should be in danger of fall-

"HARLEM, 24 September, 1776," may be referred to, as a specimen of all of them.

[1] The correspondence of John Adams with his wife, which has been published, will show the anxious uncertainty which prevailed in the Congress.

[2] [Hall's] *History of the Civil War in America*, i., 201; Stedman's *History of the American War*, i., 210.

[3] *General Howe to Lord George Germaine*, "NEW-YORK ISLAND, 25 Sept., "1776;" *Annual Register for 1776*; *History of Europe*, 176; [Hall's] *History of the Civil War in America*, i., 201; Stedman's *History of the American War*, i., 209, 210; etc.

[4] *Memoirs of General Heath*, 67, 68.

[5] *Journal of the Committee of Safety*, "Tuesday afternoon, Augt. 27, "1776;" *the same*, "FISHKILL, in DUTCHESS COUNTY, September the 2nd, "1776;" *Journal of the Convention*, "Die Sabbati, 4 ho., P.M., Septr. "7th, 1776;" *Journal of the Committee of Safety*, "Monday afternoon, "Sept. 23, 1776;" etc.

[6] *Journal of the Convention*, "Die Jovis, 8 ho., P.M., Augt. 22, 1776;" *Journal of the Committee of Safety*, "Tuesday afternoon, Augt. 27, 1776;" *the same*, "Die Jovis, 9 ho., A.M., Sept. 12, 1776;" *Journal of the Convention*, "Die Veneris, 9 ho., A.M., Octor. 4, 1776;" etc.

[7] *The Convention to the Committees of Stonington, New-London, Groton, Lyme, Saybrook, Guilford, New Haven, Stratford, Fairfield, Milford, Norwalk, Stamford, and Horseneck*, (in each instance) "Wednesday morning, "Augt. 28, 1776;" *the same to Governor Trumbull*, "Wednesday morning, "HARLEM, 28th Augt., 1776;" etc.

[8] *Journal of the Committee of Safety*, "AT THE HOUSE OF MR. ODELL, "PHILIPSE'S MANOR, Augt. 31, 1776;" *the Committee of Safety to General Washington*, "Augt. 31, 1776."

[9] *Journal of the Committee of Safety*, "Monday morning, Octor. 11th, "1776."

"ing into the hands of the enemy, be empowered "either to remove it or them, therefrom, or, if that "should not be practicable, to destroy the same;" "that the Commissary or Commissaries hereby ap-"pointed be empowered to appoint Agents under "them, and to call upon any officer commanding any "part of the Militia, for such detachments of the men "under his command as will be necessary to carry "the same into execution;" "that Mr. Stephen Ward "apply to the Commissary-general for such sums of "money as will, from time to time, be necessary to "carry the above Resolves into execution;" and "that a copy of the above Resolutions be sent to His "Excellency General Washington and to the Com-"missary-general, requesting their assistance in car-"rying the same into execution."[1] In the absence of General Lewis Morris, whose hankerings were evidently for something else than for active service in the field, at the head of his Brigade,[2] Colonel Joseph Drake, of New Rochelle, the senior Colonel, was placed in command of the Westchester-county Militia, with instructions to "call out as many of the Militia, "with five days provisions, as he shall think suffi-"cient to watch the motions of the enemy's ships,[3] "now in the Sound, and to prevent all communica-"tion with the disaffected inhabitants in said County; "and that he send notice, from time to time, to the "Convention, of every remarkable occurrence; and, "for that purpose, that he is hereby empowered to "press horses, when he shall think it necessary."[4] In faithful compliance with the Order thus sent to him, enough of the Militia were ordered out to guard from Rye-neck to Rodman's-neck, Colonel Graham's Regiment being at Throgg's-neck; and Colonel Budd was to send a hundred men and to guard from the Snuff-mills to Rye-neck.[5] Two days after the disastrous engagement on Long Island, the Convention adjourned from Harlem to Fishkill;[6] and its Committee followed, holding sessions, while on it way, at King's Bridge,[7] at the house of Mr. Odell on Philipse's Manor,[8] at the house of John Blagge, at Croton-river;[9] and, possibly, elsewhere.[10] It constructed fire-ships, for the protection of the Hudson-river from the enemy's vessels;[11] and it continued the support of the State's cruisers, on the ocean.[12] It attended to the removal of the military stores which were endangered by the movements of the enemy;[13] it ordered all the bells to be taken from the Churches[14] and all the brass knockers from the doors of houses,[15] "in order that the "fortune of War may not throw the same into the "hands of our enemy and deprive this State, at this "critical period, of that necessary, though unfortu-"nate, resource for supplying our want of cannon;" it provided Lances for those of the Militia whom it was unable to provide with other arms;[16] and when General Washington's supply of Gunpowder had become unsafely small, it replenished it from its own resources.[17] It appointed, on the motion of John Jay, a special "Committee of Safety and Correspondence "for that part of this State which lies below the "Highlands," Colonel Henry Remsen, Major Garret Abeel, and Major Peter Pra Van Zandt, all of them of the City of New York, having been appointed as that Committee;[18] but, notwithstanding James Duane and John Jay and William Duer were also appointed "to draw up Instructions" for that Committee, and notwithstanding the stirring events of which that portion of the State, "below the Highlands," very soon became the scene, nothing more was heard of either the Instructions or the Committee of Safety which was thus erected. It strengthened the works which had been thrown up for the defense of the Highlands; and it added to those defences some "works on the East side of the river, about three "miles below Fort Montgomery, at a place called "Red Hook, near Peekskill, which are well-calcu-

[1] *Journal of the Committee of Safety*, "Monday morning, Octor. 11th, "1776."

These Resolutions were proposed by Robert R. Livington.

[2] On the sixteenth of September, "the Convention was informed "that the Militia of Westchester-county are not so properly arranged "and managed as they ought to be, at this critical juncture, which is "occasioned by the absence of General Morris;" and it "Therefore, "RESOLVED, That General Morris, now at the General Congress, do im-"mediately return and resume the command of his Brigade;" and ordered the Resolution to be transmitted to General Morris, "with the "utmost despatch." (*Journal*, "Die Lunæ, 4 ho., P.M., Sept. 16, 1776.") The General's reply to that order of the Convention, dated "PHILADEL-"PHIA, Septr. 24, 1776," is one of the most remarkable displays of evident cowardice and military imbecility on record, (*vide page 204, ante*;) and if the withering rejoinder, written by Robert R. Livingston, which the Committee of Safety sent to the General, with a peremptory Order to take the command of his Brigade, dated "October the 8th, 1776," did not effect its purpose, it certainly conveyed to the bashful Brigadier an evidence of what others thought of his remarkable conduct, as a soldier.

[3] Two ships and a brig came to anchor, a little above Throgg's-neck, on the twenty-seventh of August; and made a raid on City-island (*vide page 219, ante.*)

[4] *Journal of the Committee of Safety*, "Tuesday morning, August 27, "1776."

[5] *Colonel Joseph Drake to the Convention*, "NEW-ROCHELL, Augt. 28, 1776."

[6] *Journal of the Convention*, "Thursday morning, Augt. 29, 1776."

[7] *Journal of the Committee of Safety*, "KING'S BRIDGE, Augt. 30, 1776."

[8] *Journal of the Committee of Safety*, "AT THE HOUSE OF MR. ODELL, "PHILIPSE'S MANOR, Augt. 31, 1776."

[9] *Journal of the Committee of Safety*, "CROTON-RIVER, AT THE HOUSE OF "JNO. BLAGGE, Augt. 31, 1776."

[10] There is no record of the doings of the Committee, on Sunday, the first of September, although it evidently continued its journey, from the Croton-river to Fishkill, on that day.

[11] *Journal of the Convention*, "Thursday morning, Augt. 29, 1776;" *the same*, "Die Sabbati, 9 ho., A.M., Sept. 21, 1776;" *General Washington to the Convention*, "HEAD-QUARTERS, HEIGHTS OF HARLEM, Sept. 20, "1776;" etc.

[12] *Journal of the Committee of Safety*, "Tuesday afternoon, Septr. 24, "1776;" *the same*, "Wednesday morning, Septr. 25, 1776;" *Journal of the Convention*, "Saturday morning, September 28, 1776;" etc.

[13] *Journal of the Committee of Safety*, "P.M., September 3, 1776;" *Journal of the Convention*, "Die Sabbati, 9 ho., A.M., Sept. 7, 1776;" etc.

[14] *Journal of the Convention*, "Die Jovis, 4 ho., P.M., Sept. 5, 1776;" *General Washington to the Convention*, "HEAD-QUARTERS, NEW-YORK, "Septr. 8, 1776."

[15] *Journal of the Convention*, "Die Sabbati, 9 ho., A.M., Sept. 7, 1776."

[16] Vide pages 205, 206, ante.

[17] *Journal of the Committee of Safety*, "Friday morning, Sept. 27, 1776;" *Journal of the Convention*, "Saturday morning, September 28, 1776."

[18] *Journal of the Convention*, "Die Sabbati, 9 ho., A.M., Sept. 7, 1776."

"lated to prevent the enemy's landing on that side "and becoming masters of the Highlands, opposite to "Fort Montgomery."[1] When the evacuation of the City of New York was made at the expense of large quantities of Flour, it appointed Agents, with instructions to purchase all the Flour which could be obtained in Duchess, Orange, and Ulster-counties, and to send it to the Commissary-general of the Army, at Spyt den Duivel-creek:[2] when the Army needed Pork, Beef, and other Stores, the Convention opened its Storehouses, in Westchester-county, into which it had gathered large quantities of the products of that County, the crops of the preceding year:[3] it purchased material for and provided for the manufacture of Clothing, for the Army:[4] it busied itself about salting Pork, in the County of Westchester, during the approaching season:[5] and whatever it supposed would promote the common cause and whatever it was requested to do, for that purpose, by either the Continental Congress or the Commander-in-chief or the General commanding the northern Army, was done, to the full extent of its ability and resources, with cheerfulness, promptitude, and thoroughness, never failing to receive, in return, the unqualified and entire approval of him whose entire approval was never idly bestowed.

On the twenty-first of September, the American Army, at Kingsbridge and its dependencies, which included General Heath's command, in Westchester-county, consisted, nominally, of four thousand, five hundred, and twenty-eight Commissioned Officers, Staff, and Non-commissioned Officers, and twenty-seven thousand, three hundred, and seventy-seven rank and file, exclusive of Colonel Knox's Regiment of Artillery, which contained, nominally, five hundred and forty-three men, including all the Commissioned and Non-commissioned Officers and Staff, and exclusive, also, of Colonel Durkee's Regiment and a Company of Artillery, both of them at Powle's-hook, now Jersey City, from whom no *Returns* had been received, during that week. But of those nearly twenty-eight thousand men, in the ranks, four thousand, four hundred, and fifty-three were present, sick; three thousand, four hundred, and thirty-three were absent, sick; three thousand, eight hundred, and thirty were absent, "on command;" and ninety-six were on furlough; leaving only about sixteen thousand men, including the Artillery and excluding the Officers, who were actually present and fit for duty.[6] Of these, thirteen Regiments were Militia, temporarily serving in the service of the Continent;[7] and, since the disastrous results on Long Island and in the City of New York, the entire Army was greatly dispirited and inspired no confidence in its Commander-in-chief.[8] On the thirtieth of September, the number of rank and file,

[1] *Journal of the Convention*, "Die Sabbati, 4 ho., P.M., Septr. 7, 1776."

[2] *Commissary-general Trumbull to the Convention*, "KING'S BRIDGE, 16 "Sept., 1776;" *Journal of the Convention*, "Dies Martis, 4 ho., P.M., "Septr. 17, 1776."

We have followed Washington Irving, in his historical writings, in our orthography of the name of that celebrated stream, notwithstanding the usual manner of spelling the words is considerably different.

[3] *Journal of the Provincial Congress*, "Die Mercurii, 9 ho., A.M., Septr. "18, 1776;" *the same*, "Die Veneris, 9 ho., A.M., Octor. 4, 1776."

[4] *Journal of the Provincial Congress*, "Die Jovis, 9 ho., A.M., Octor. 3, "1776;" *Journal of the Committee of Safety*, "Die Mercurii, 9 ho., A.M., "Octr. 9, 1776;" *the same*, "Thursday morning, Octor. 17, 1776."

Stephen Ward, Gilbert Strang, and Phil. Leak were appointed to buy coarse woollen Cloth, Linsey-woolsey, Blankets, woollen Hose, Mittens, coarse Linen, felt Hats, and Shoes, to the value of three hundred pounds—seven hundred and fifty dollars—in Westchester-county; and they were ordered to have the Linen made up into shirts.

[5] *Journal of the Committee of Safety*, "Thursday, Octor. 10, 1776."

[6] *General Return of the Army in the service of the United States of America at King's Bridge and its dependencies, Sept. 21, 1776.*

[7] Ibid.

[8] "The check our detachment sustained on the 27th ultimo has dis-"pirited too great a proportion of our troops, and filled their minds with, "apprehension and despair. The Militia, instead of calling forth their "utmost efforts to a brave and manly opposition, in order to repair our "losses, are dismayed, intractable, and impatient to return. Great num-"bers of them have gone off; in some instances, almost by whole Regi-"ments, by half ones, and by Companies, at a time. This circumstance, "of itself, independent of others, when fronted by a well-appointed "enemy, superior in number to our whole collected force, would be "sufficiently disagreeable; but, when their example has infected another "part of the Army, when their want of discipline and refusal of almost "every kind of restraint or government have produced a like conduct "but too common to the whole and an entire disregard of that order "and subordination necessary to the well-being of an Army, and which "had been inculcated before, as well as the nature of our military es-"tablishment would admit of, our condition becomes still more alarm-"ing; and, with the deepest concern, I am obliged to confess my want "of confidence in the generality of the troops." (*General Washington to the President of the Congress*, "NEW-YORK, September 2, 1776.")

"Before I conclude, I must take the liberty of mentioning to Congress "the great distress we are in for want of money. Two months' pay (and "more to some Battalions) is now due to the troops, here, without any-"thing in the Military chest to satisfy it. This occasions much dissatis-"faction and almost a general uneasiness. Not a day passes without "complaints and the most importunate and urgent demands, on this "head. As it may injure the service greatly, and the want of a reg-"ular supply of Cash produces consequences of the most fatal tendency, "I entreat the attention of Congress to this subject, and that we may "be provided, as soon as can be, with a sum equal to every present "claim." (*General Washington to the President of the Congress*, "NEW-"YORK, 6 September, 1776.")

In his letter to the Congress, on the eighth of September, the General said, "On every side, there is a choice of difficulties; and every "measure, on our part, however painful the reflection is, from experi-"ence, is to be formed with some apprehension that all our troops "will not do their duty." After the experience of the General had been made more complete, by the cowardice of the troops at Kip's-bay, he thus wrote, also to the Congress, "We are now encamped, with "the main body of the Army, on the Heights of Haerlem, where I should "hope the enemy would meet with a defeat, in case of an attack, if the "generality of our troops would behave with tolerable bravery. But "experience, to my extreme affliction, has convinced me that this is "rather to be wished for than expected. However, I trust that there "are many who will act like men, and show themselves worthy of the "blessings of freedom." (*Letter to the Congress*, "HEAD-QUARTERS, AT "COLONEL MORRIS'S HOUSE, 16 September, 1776.") On the day after the date of the *Returns of the Army* which are referred to in the text, the General wrote to his brother, "the dependence which the Congress have "placed upon the Militia has already greatly injured and, I fear, will "totally ruin our cause. Being subject to no control, themselves, they "introduce disorder among the troops whom we have attempted to dis-"cipline; while the change in their living brings on sickness; and this "causes an impatience to get home, which spreads, universally, and in-"troduces abominable desertions. In short, it is not in the power of "words to describe the task I have to perform. Fifty thousand pounds "would not induce me again to undergo what I have done." (*General Washington to John Augustine Washington*, "HEIGHTS OF HAERLEM, 22 "September, 1776.")

present and fit for duty, including Colonel Knox's Regiment of Artillery, was reduced to fifteen thousand, one hundred, and four;[1] and on the fifth of October, the same rank and file, present and fit for duty, including the Artillery, numbered only fourteen thousand, four hundred, and eighty-six, exclusive of seven skeleton Regiments of Connecticut and Rhode Island, forming two nominal Brigades, each with its full complements of Officers and Staff, in which there were nominally twelve hundred and seventy-five men, present and fit for duty. There was, also, a body of Massachusetts Militia, "computed at four thousand, "so scattered and ignorant of the forms of *Returns* "that none can be got;" and a Regiment of New Hampshire Militia was posted at the White Plains and another at the Fishkills, "under the like circum-"stances."[2]

While the American Army was thus made weaker, day by day, by the disaffection or the despair of the sickly, despondent, home-sick, and ill-provided-for men who composed it—men who, in multitudes of instances, had enlisted either from necessity, occasioned by the prevailing prostration of every kind of business, or because they had been enforced to do so, by drafts, or because it had afforded opportunities for speculation and plunder, without, in either class, the slightest pretence to a care for "the "cause of America" or to even a love of country—the Royal Army, well-appointed and well-officered, numbered upwards of thirty thousand effective men, exclusive of those who were left for the protection of Staten Island and of those who were sick.[3] Indeed, in the graphic language of one of the most able writers of that period, at the time now under consideration an intimate friend of the master-spirits of the Convention of New York, "The British Army was "commanded by able and experienced Officers; the "rebel by men destitute of military skill or experience "and, for the most part, taken from mechanic arts or "the plough. The first were possessed of the best "appointments, and of more than they could use; "and the other of the worst, and of less than they "wanted. The one were attended by the ablest Sur-"geons and Physicians, healthy, and high-spirited; "the other were neglected in their health, clothing, "and pay, were sickly, and constantly murmuring "and dissatisfied. And the one were veteran troops, "carrying victory and conquest wheresoever they were "led; the other were new-raised and undisciplined, "a panic-struck and defeated enemy, whenever at-"tacked—such is the true comparative difference "between the force sent to suppress, and that which "supported, the Rebellion."[4]

[1] *Return of Brigades under the immediate command of His Excellency George Washington*, "HARLEM HEIGHTS, HEAD-QUARTERS, September 30, "1776."

[2] *Weekly Return of the Regiments of Horse and Foot, under the immediate command of His Excellency George Washington*, "HARLEM HEIGHTS, Oc-"tober 5, 1776."

General Lincoln's command can scarcely be regarded, with any propriety, as a portion of the main Army nor as a part of the fighting force of any Army, since it was sent for, to perform police duty, to quiet the apprehensions of the Convention of New York on account of the disaffected, in that State—those whom the Congresses and the Committees had forced into disaffection, by the outrages which had been inflicted on them, in the vain attempt to secure an entire conformity of political opinions with the *official* opinions of the dominant faction.

[3] General Howe's *Returns* show that, when he occupied Staten Island, after the arrival of the reinforcements brought by Lord Howe, say on the ninth of August, his command numbered, including his Officers, twenty-nine thousand, three hundred, and eight, of whom twenty-four thousand, two hundred, and twenty-seven were rank and file, fit for duty. (*Reply to the* Observations of Lieut. Gen. Sir William Howe, on a pamphlet, entitled *Letters to a Nobleman*, Second Edition, 37.) Three days after the date of that *Return*, [*August* 12,] the two fleets, convoyed, respectively, by Commodore Hotham and the *Repulse*, came into the harbor of New York, with the Guards and the First Division of the Hessians. (*Compare Lord George Germaine's despatch to General Howe, dated*, "WHITEHALL, 21 "June, 1776," *with General Howe's despatch to Lord George Germaine, dated* "STATEN-ISLAND, 15 August, 1776;") and, two days subsequently, [*August* 14,] Sir Peter Parker and Lord Dunmore also arrived, (*General Howe to Lord George Germaine*, "STATEN-ISLAND, 15 August, 1776,") the former, with what remained of the forces which had been sent to Virginia and the Carolinas, "as well as with some Regiments from Florida "and the West Indies," (*Annual Register for* 1776: *History of Europe*, *169,) numbering, "at least, five thousand men," (Jones's *History of New York during the Revolutionary War*, i., 110;) the latter, "with the refu-"gees and blackamores from Virginia," (*the same*, i., 103,) "about a "thousand more" (*the same*, i., 110.) The Second Division of the Hessians, the Sixteenth Regiment of Light Dragoons, the horses for remounting the Seventeenth Regiment of Dragoons, the draught-horses for the Artillery and baggage, four hundred and two German and not far from five hundred British recruits, and the Prince of Waldeck's Regiment of German troops, all of whom joined General Howe, while he was in Westchester-county, as we shall see, hereafter—were on their way to America, at the time of which we write. (*Lord George Germaine to General Howe*, "WHITEHALL, 21 June, 1776.") There were, also, some Provincial "Corps, already raised," of whom we have seen no Returns, (*General Howe to Lord George Germaine*, "STATEN-ISLAND, 19 August, "1776,") probably not strong in numbers, but, nevertheless, entitled to notice, in this connection.

From these facts, it appears that the entire force, present and commanded by General Howe, before he opened the Campaign on Long Island, was upwards of forty thousand men, exclusive of the Marines on the several Fleets, which could have been called ashore, had there been any necessity for their services. Only one Brigade of Hessians, a detachment of the Fourteenth Regiment, some convalescents, and those recruits which had already arrived, were left on Staten Island; and the Sick-list was very small; there were no detachments on special duties; and there could have been none absent on furlough: it is very clear, therefore, that when the Royal Army was moved from Staten Island, it numbered very little, if any, less than thirty-eight thousand effective men, including its Officers. In the Battle of Long Island, it was said to have lost only three hundred and sixty-seven of all classes, (*General Howe to Lord George Germaine*, "NEWTOWN, LONG-ISLAND, 3 Sept., 1776;") only "about" ninety-two were said to have been killed or wounded at Harlem. (*General Howe to Lord George Germaine*, "HEAD-QUARTERS, "YORK ISLAND, 21 September, 1776;") the occupation of Powle's Hook, Long Island, and the City of New York required detachments, of course; but there can be little doubt that the Army which General Howe moved from Throg's-neck numbered very little, if any, less than thirty thousand, Officers and men, fit for active service.

In confirmation of this estimate of the strength of General Howe's command, in Westchester-county, we may be permitted to state that, after the arrival of the Second Division of the Hessians and of those other reinforcements to which Lord George Germaine made reference, already noticed, but with the losses which it had sustained in Westchester-county and at Fort Washington deducted, on the twenty-second of November, 1776, "the force under General Howe's immediate command" is said to have been thirty-one thousand, seven hundred, and fifty-five, Officers and men, fit for active service. (*Reply to the* Observations of Lieut. Gen. Sir William Howe, on a pamphlet entitled *Letters to a Nobleman*, 37.)

[4] [Joseph Galloway's] *Letters to a Nobleman*, 31, 35.

As we have said, the two Armies were occupied, during several weeks after the Royal Army had taken the City of New York, in throwing up defensive works—the American Army, on the Heights of Harlem, to the northward and eastward of the present village of Manhattanville, back, to Kingsbridge, and in the more exposed portions of Westchester-county: the Royal Army, on the Heights of Harlem and on Vandewater's Heights, southward from the village of Manhattanville, and thence to McGowan's-pass, where the postroad to the northward and eastward descended from the high grounds, forming the northernmost portion of the present great City's Central Park, to the Harlem-plains, below[1]—and some time was, also, necessarily employed by General Howe, in obtaining information concerning the face of the country, in the rear of the positions occupied by the American Army, "upon a supposition that the enemy" [*the American Army*] "should remove from King's-"Bridge," which information, thus sought in advance of any movement of the Army, was become more necessary since he had found the Americans not so well-disposed to join and to serve the Royal Army, in the field, as he had been taught to expect;[2] and because the country referred to, the County of Westchester, "was so covered with wood, swamps, "and creeks, that it was not open, in the least de-"gree, to be known, but from post to post or from "accounts to be collected from the inhabitants, who "are entirely ignorant of military description."[3] Indeed, during that period, because of the character of the country, in its advantages for defensive operations, and because of his great disappointment, in his failure to receive the support, in arms, from those who were disaffected, which he had been led to expect, General Howe, also, became dispirited and disheartened, even to the extent of losing confidence in his own abilities and in those of his immense and well-officered and well-disciplined command to make any further progress, during that Campaign, nor until the arrival of heavy reinforcements, during the ensuing Winter and Spring.[4] General Howe had

[1] Vide page 221, ante.

See, also, *General Howe to Lord George Germaine*, "NEW YORK "ISLAND, 25 September, 1776;" *the same to the same*, "NEW-YORK, 30 "November, 1776;" *Speech of Sir William Howe before a Committee of the House of Commons*, April 29, 1779,—Almon's *Parliamentary Register*, xii. 323; *Testimony of the Earl of Cornwallis before a Committee of the House of Commons*, May 6, 1779.—Almon's *Parliamentary Register*, xiii., 3; etc.

[2] Vide page 212, ante.

That disappointment was expressed to the Home Government, in the General's despatch of the twenty-fifth of September, 1776, in these words: "We must also have recruits from Europe, not finding the Amer-"icans disposed to serve with arms, notwithstanding the hopes held out "to me, upon my arrival at this post." In his *Speech before a Committee of the House of Commons, on the twenty-ninth of April*, 1779, the General repeated the expression of his disappointment, on that subject, in these emphatic words: "I must, here, add, that I found the Americans "not so well-disposed to join us, and to serve, as I had been taught to "expect." The careful student of the history of that period will also bear testimony, in confirmation of what General Howe thus wrote and said, that the Americans those who had been persecuted and outraged because of "suspicions" that they were "disaffected," notwithstanding the very reasonable reasons which they had for thus transferring their strength to the Royal Army, generally remained at their homes, with their families, without voluntarily taking up arms, in either Army; and that the Loyal Battalions were composed, almost exclusively, of the floating population, largely men of foreign birth or Americans whose immoralities or necessities had induced them to enter the service. They were relatively few in numbers; and but for the personal respectability of those who led them, their services would have been only nominal.

We are not unmindful, in what we have thus said, of the great use of that loyal element which Joseph Galloway made in his very lawyer-like publications; but we have also borne in mind, that those publications were made for personal and partisan purposes; and that, like his earlier associates in duplicity and treachery, he was capable of resorting to unsavory means for the accomplishment of any given end in which he was personally interested, justifying the employment of those means by the character of the proposed end, and boldly and unreservedly doing evil in order that what he was pleased to regard as good might, therefrom, be secured.

[3] *General Howe's Speech before a Committee of the House of Commons*, April 29, 1779.

In his examination before a Committee of the House of Commons, on the sixth of May, 1779, the Earl of Cornwallis testified that "the knowl-"edge of the country of America, for military purposes, was extremely "difficult to be obtained from the inhabitants;" that "the country, in "general, is so covered with wood and so favorable to ambuscades that, "certainly, it was very difficult to obtain a knowledge of it by recon-"noitering;" and that he "never saw a stronger country or one better "calculated for the defensive." In another portion of his testimony, the Earl stated, "I can only say that it is a very strong country, very "rugged, very hilly, and very woody;" and that, although, "by no means "equally so," his former description was "applicable, in some degree, "to all." General Gray, before the same Committee and on the same day, testified that "the inhabitants of the country, in general, were so very much "against us that they deserted the country wherever we came; and "could get no intelligence that we could possibly depend on;" that "that part of America where I have been, is the strongest country I ever "was in. It is every where hilly and covered with wood, intersected by "ravines, creeks, and marshy grounds; and every quarter of a mile, is "a post fitted for ambuscades. Little or no knowledge could be obtained "by reconnoitering;" and "America is, of all countries, the best calcu-"lated for the defensive: every one hundred yards might be disputed, "at least that part of it that I have seen."

During a visit which he made to us, at our home, near the White Plains, previously to the late Civil War, General John E. Wool, a veteran in the service of the United States, was peculiarly emphatic concerning the natural capabilities of Westchester-county, for a defensive warfare.

[4] "Upon the present appearance of things, I look upon the further "progress of this Army, for the Campaign, to be rather precarious, an "attack upon Rhode Island excepted, which I would willingly defer, "for a short time, in case it should be thought advisible to employ our "whole force together. * * * But, in my situation, I presume, I "must not risk, as a check, at this time, would be of infinite detriment "to us.

"The enemy is too strongly posted to be attacked in front; and in-"numerable difficulties are in my way of forcing him, on either side, "though his Army is much dispirited from the late success of his "Majesty's arms; yet have I not the smallest prospect of finishing the "contest, this Campaign, nor until the Rebels see preparations, in the "Spring, that may preclude all thoughts of further resistance. To this "end, I would propose eight or ten line-of-battle Ships, to be with us in "February, with a number of supernumerary Seamen, for manning boats, "having fully experienced the want of them, in every movement we have "made. We must, also, have recruits from Europe, not finding the "Americans disposed to serve with arms, notwithstanding the hopes "held out to me, upon my arrival at this port."—(*General Howe to Lord George Germaine*, "NEW-YORK ISLAND, 25 September, 1776," received by his lordship, November 2, 1776.)

"With regard to the knowledge of the country, so necessary to be ob-"tained previous to the movement from New-York, I beg leave to men-"tion the difficulties we labored under, in that respect, throughout the "War. The country is so covered with wood, swamps, and creeks, that "it is not open, in the least degree, to be known but from post to post or "from accounts to be collected from the inhabitants, who are entirely "ignorant of military description. These circumstances were, therefore

not learned the more modern military theory of "attrition," no matter at what cost, nor was he of the same school of politics as that in which Bute and Germaine and Dundas and Wedderburne and Jay and Duane and the Livingstons and the Morrises were preceptors, of high or low degree: on the other hand he did not expose his command where the object to be attained was inadequate,[1] nor was he inclined to visit the country, even that portion of it which was antagonistic to the Royal Army, with severity.[2]

Whatever may have inspired and encouraged him, notwithstanding all whichs he had previously said of the "innumerable difficulties in his way, "of turning him," ["*the enemy*,"] "on either side," and of his own, evidently well-considered, apprehensions of an unfavorable result, should an attempt be made to do so, General Howe determined to endeavor to turn the left flank of the American Army, encamped on the Heights of Harlem and in Westchester-county, with a view of compelling it to abandon its very strong position and, if possible, of bringing it to action. As the defensive works, on the high grounds to the southward of the Harlem plains, with the moderate detachment which he could leave, for the purpose of occupying them and the other portions of the City of New York, and with the further protection which was afforded by the Fleet and the increased safety which had been afforded by the capture of the American works at Powle's-hook, appeared to afford all the protection which would be necessary, there seemed to have been little probability that General Washington would make any attempt to recover, or even to raid, that City; and the determination of General Howe was, therefore, a reasonable one, and, with such a force and with such appointments as he, then, controlled, there was a reasonable probability that it would be attended with an entire success.

On Sunday, the fifteenth of September, in order to draw the attention of the Americans from the preparations which were being made, on Long Island, for the occupation of the City of New York, by the Royal Army—which was successfully accomplished, later in the day—the *Phœnix*, of forty-four guns, and commanded by Captain Hyde Parker, the *Roebuck*, of forty-four guns, and commanded by Captain Hammond, and the *Tartar*, of twenty-eight guns, commanded by Captain Ommany, each with a tender, had been moved up the Hudson-river, as far as Bloomingdale;[3] and they had remained at anchor, at that place after the Royal Army had occupied that City, covering the left flank of the lines and very effectually closing the navigation of the lower portion of the river, to the Americans. But, about eight o'clock, on the morning of Wednesday, the ninth of October, they got under way and stood, with an easy southerly breeze, up the river. The Americans, with great labor and outlay of means, had constructed a *chevaux-de-frise*, for the protection of the navigation, above Fort Washington;[4] and it was hoped it would have intercepted the further passage of the ships while the batteries, at Fort Washington and Fort Lee, and the galleys, which had been stationed behind the *chevaux-de-frise*, played on them; but, "to the surprise and "mortification" of General Washington and his command, they passed all the obstructions, "without the "least difficulty, and without receiving any apparent "damage from our forts,[5] though they kept up a "heavy fire from both sides of the river."[6]

"the cause of some unavoidable delay, in our movements. I must, here, "add that I found the Americans not so well-disposed to join us and to "serve, as I had been taught to expect; that I thought our further "progress, for the present, precarious; and that I saw no prospect of "finishing the War, that campaign. These sentiments I communicated "to the Secretary of State, in the letters last mentioned."—(General Howe's *Speech before a Committee of the House of Commons*, April 29, 1779.)

[1] "The most essential duty I had to observe was, not wantonly to com-"mit his Majesty's troops where the object was inadequate. I knew, "well, that any considerable loss sustained by the Army could not, "speedily nor easily, be repaired. I also knew that one great point "towards gaining the confidence of an Army—and a General without it "is upon the most dangerous ground—is never to expose the Troops, "where, as I said before, the object is inadequate."—(General Howe's *Speech before a Committee of the House of Commons*, April 29, 1779.)

[2] "Although some persons condemn me for having endeavoured to con-"ciliate his Majesty's rebellious subjects, by taking every means to pre-"vent the destruction of the country instead of irritating them by a con-"trary mode of proceeding: yet am I, from many reasons, satisfied, in "my own mind, that I acted, in that particular, for the benefit of the "King's service."—(General Howe's *Speech before a Committee of the House of Commons*, April 29, 1779.)

[3] *General Washington to the President of Congress*, "HEAD-QUARTERS, "AT COLONEL MORRIS'S HOUSE, 16 September, 1776;" *General Howe to Lord George Germaine*, "HEAD-QUARTERS, NEW-YORK, September 21, "1776;" *The New-York Gazette and the Weekly Mercury*, No. 1363, NEW-YORK, Monday, October 14, 1776.

General Heath, (*Memoirs*, 69,) said these Ships were "sent up the "river, as far as Greenwich," only, on the *fourteenth* of September.

[4] Doctor Sparks, in his *Writings of George Washington*, (iv., 20, note,) said "the mode of constructing the *chevaux-de-frise* was a contrivance of "General Putnam's;" and, in support of that statement, he quoted from a letter written by the General to General Gates, dated July 26th, in which were these words: "We are preparing *chevaux-de-frise*, at which "we make great dispatch by the help of ships, which are to be sunk; a "scheme of mine, which you may be assured is very simple, a plan of "which I send you."

Had not the General's own words been given in support of the statement, we should have supposed the Doctor had mistaken the General for Colonel Rufus Putnam, who was an Engineer: and the more so, since even the most zealous of the General's biographers and eulogists are silent, on this subject. Possibly, however, that silence may be accounted for, from the result of the professional stupidity of the Engineer, whomsoever he may have been.

[5] In this instance, General Washington was mistaken, since the "ships "suffered much, in their masts and rigging;" and Captain Parker subsequently reported that the *Phœnix* lost a Midshipman, two Seamen, and one Servant killed, and a Boatswain, a Carpenter, eight Seamen, a Servant, a negro Man, and a private Marine, wounded; that the *Roebuck* lost a Lieutenant, a Midshipman, and two Seamen, killed, and a Midshipman, two Seamen, and a Corporal of Marines, wounded; and that the *Tartar* lost a Midshipman, killed, and a Lieutenant of Marines wounded.—(*Report of the Killed and Wounded on board His Majesty's Ships passing the Batteries, the 9th of October*, 1776.)

See, also, Admiral Lord Howe's despatch to the Secretary of the Admiralty, "EAGLE OFF NEW-YORK, November 23, 1776."

[6] *General Washington to the Congress*, "HEIGHTS OF HARLEM, 7 October, 1776," postscript, dated "October 9th;" *Lieutenant-colonel Tench Tilghman to the Committee of Safety*, "HEAD-QUARTERS, HARLEM-HEIGHTS, "9 Octr, 1776;" *General George Clinton to the Convention*, "KING'S BRIDGE, "10 October, 1776;" *The New-York Gazette and the Weekly Mercury*, N

It would not have been very apparent how these vessels could have passed such seemingly formidable obstructions, "without the least difficulty," nor for what especial reason General Washington was "sur-"prised and mortified," when such a passage had been successfully acomplished, had not General George Clinton, who commanded the Militia of the State who had been called out for the reinforcement of the Continental Army, at Kingsbridge, informed the Convention that the ships had "passed by, in shore, "East of our obstructions in the river"[1]—that the deep waters of the river, in shore, immediately around the point which juts into the river, at that place, had been left entirely unprotected—a fact which reflects very little credit on the skill or the forethought of either the Engineer or those who were employed in building the obstructions, especially since the *Phœnix* and the *Rose* and their respective tenders had passed the same obstructions, in the same way, on the eighteenth of August, after the galleys and the fireships had rendered their longer stay, in the waters of the Hudson-river, both unprofitable and hazardous.[2]

After the vessels had passed the obstructions, they ran up the river as far as Dobbs's-ferry, where they again cast anchor. On their passage up the river, they captured two or three small river-craft—one of them loaded with Rum, Sugar, Wine, etc.—and sunk a sloop which had on board a machine invented by Mr. Bushnell, for blowing up the British Fleet.[3] Two new ships, purchased for the further obstruction of the channel of the river, were driven ashore, near Yonkers—one of them was afterwards recovered, however, by a party of men whom General Clinton sent from Kingsbridge, for that purpose;[4] and two galleys, which had been stationed near the obstructions, were also driven ashore, near Dobbs's-ferry, and captured by the enemy.[5] While the ships were at anchor, off Dobbs's-ferry, a boat's crew was sent ashore, and signalized its presence by plundering a store, and by staving the casks and setting the building on fire; but the fire was extinguished by the Americans, after the enemy had returned to his boat.[6]

The movement of the ships, up the river, and the consequent control of the latter, notwithstanding the obstructions on which so much dependence had been rested, very promptly called forth the entire energies of General George Clinton[7] and General Heath,[8] both of them in Westchester-county, to prevent the enemy from effecting a landing and for the protection of the property which was exposed to the ravages of his tenders and boats; and, of course, the vigilant Commander-in-chief immediately despatched an express to the Convention, that notice might be immediately communicated to General James Clinton, commanding the forts, in the Highlands, putting him on his guard, and directing that precautions should be taken to prevent the river-craft from falling into the hands of the enemy—the General was not informed of the destination of the ships nor of the purposes of the movement; but he was not, apparently, very much alarmed, and supposed, only, that they were sent to cut off the communication of the American Army, by water, to the northward; "probably to gain recruits;" and to close the supplies of the Americans, especially those of Boards, for the construction of Barracks,

---

1303, NEW-YORK, Monday, October 14, 1776; *The Freeman's Journal and New-Hampshire Gazette*, Volume 1, Number 27, PORTSMOUTH, Tuesday, November 26, 1776; *The Pennsylvania Journal*, No. 1767, PHILADELPHIA, Wednesday, October 16, 1776; Sauthier's *Plan of the Operations of the King's Army under the command of General Sr William Howe, K. B., in New York and East New Jersey*, Ed. London: 1777—opposite—; *Memoirs of General Heath*, 68; etc.

[1] *General George Clinton to the Convention*, "KING'S BRIDGE, 10 October, 1776."

[2] Vide page 216, ante.

[3] The late Charles J. Bushnell, of New York, well known among numismatists and antiquaries, was of the same family as the Mr. Bushnell referred to, in the text; and he gathered, with great labor and much cost, everything which was known to exist, concerning that early inventor. The only description of the machine for destroying vessels at anchor, invented by him and destroyed by the enemy whom it was intended to annoy, as far as we have knowledge, may be seen in the *Memoirs of General Heath*, 69.

[4] We have some reasons for supposing that both these ships were saved; although no direct evidence appears that more than one of them was brought off. See, however, *Lieutenant-colonel Tilghman to General Heath*, "HEAD-QUARTERS, October 9, 1776;" *Colonel Reed to the same*, "October 9, 1776;" *General Putnam to the same*, "Wednesday, noon;" *Lieutenant-colonel Tilghman to Robert R. Livingston*, "HEAD-QUARTERS, "HARLEM HEIGHTS, October 10, 1776;" etc.

[5] *Lieutenants Putnam and Cleares to General Washington*, "NORTH "RIVER, October 9, 1776;" *General George Clinton to the Convention*, "KING'S BRIDGE, 10 October, 1776;" *The Philadelphia Evening Post*, Volume 2, Number 270, PHILADELPHIA, Saturday, October 12, 1776; *The Pennsylvania Journal*, No. 1767, PHILADELPHIA, October 16, 1776; *Memoirs of General Heath*, 68, 69.

[6] *Memoirs of General Heath*, 69.

Among the incidents of 1776, Bolton related the following: "Upon "the 9th of October, a body of 1100 British troops embarked on board "batteaux at Peckskill and the same night proceeded to Tarrytown, "where they landed at daybreak, and occupied the heights adjoining." —(*History of Westchester-county*, second edit., i. 348.)

Although the historian has referred to "Gaine's *Weekly Mercury*," * as his authority, we have failed to find the slightest evidence, anywhere, that such a movement as he has thus described was really made; and with the best of evidence, accessible to every one, that there were no British troops in Westchester-county, until several days after the date referred to, nor, then, within many miles from Peckskill, we dismiss the statement as something else than History.

[7] General Clinton sent out the detachment of troops which rescued one of the ships which were driven ashore, near Yonkers.—(*General George Clinton to the Convention*, "KING'S BRIDGE, 10 October, 1776.")

[8] General Heath ordered Colonel Sargent, with five hundred Infantry and forty Cavalry; Captain Horton, of the Artillery, with two twelve-pounders; and Captain Crafts, with a howitzer, to march, immediately and with all possible expedition, to Dobbs's-ferry; and the entire Division was formed, in order of battle, and "moved down, over the different "grounds which it was supposed might be the scene of action."—(*Memoirs of General Heath*, 69.)

See, also, *General Heath's Orders to Colonel Sargent*, "KING'S BRIDGE, "October 9, 1776;" David How's *Diary*, October 9, 1776; *Colonel Sargent to General Heath*, "Half past two o'clock at night, DOBB'S FERRY, "October 10, 1776;" *General Heath's Orders to Colonel Sargent*, "KING'S "BRIDGE, October 10, 1776;" etc.

---

* We have not found a file of Gaine's *New-York Gazette and the Weekly Mercury* of the latter portion of 1776; and the well-informed Mr. Kelby, of the New York Historical Society, informs us that such a file is not known to him, anywhere.

which it should have received, at an earlier day, and of which it was in great need.[1]

The enemy's Squadron got under way, again, during the evening, and sailed up the river, as far as Tarrytown; where it anchored, and remained during the entire period which was occupied by those stirring and momentous events of which their own movement, up the Hudson-river, was the earlier portion.[2]

When the information of that movement of the enemy's ships reached the Committee of Safety, at Fishkill, it was, evidently, very much alarmed; but, with that promptitude which the emergency demanded, it immediately ordered three hundred of the Militia of Ulster-county to be sent down, without any delay, to Peekskill, "well armed and accoutred, "and with three days' provisions;" that a sufficient number of the Militia of Orange-county, below the mountains—now Rockland-county—should be called out for the due protection of that portion of the western bank of the river, and one hundred from the Militia of the same County, above the mountains, should be called out and sent to Peekskill, with three days' provisions; that all the Rangers which had been enlisted for the protection of the frontiers of Ulster-county should be marched to Fishkill, evidently for the purpose of holding the more violent of the di-affected, in Duchess-county, in check; and it also sent expresses to General Schuyler, commanding the Northern Army, and to General George Clinton, at Kingsbridge, declaring its helplessness and begging "the most speedy succour." It also wrote a letter to General Washington, in which the condition of the country was thus described; "Nothing can be more "alarming than the present situation of our State. "We are daily getting the most authentic intelli-"gence of bodies of men, enlisted and armed, with "orders to assist the enemy. We much fear that "those, co-operating with the enemy, will seize such "passes as will cut off all communication between the "Army and us, and prevent your supplies. We "dare not trust any more of the Militia out of this "County, [*Duchess.*] We have called for some aid "from the two adjoining ones; but beg leave to sug-"gest to your Excellency the propriety of sending a "body of men to the Highlands or Peekskill, to "secure the passes, prevent insurrections, and [illegible] "awe the disaffected. We suppose your Excellency "has taken the necessary steps to prevent their land-"ing of any men from the ships, should they be [illegible] "inclined, as no reliance at all can be placed on the "Militia of Westchester-county."[3] Two days afterwards, Robert R. Livingston, himself a member of the Committee of Safety and present when the letter from which we have quoted was written, addressed a personal letter, appealing to General Washington to do, for the protection of the Highlands—behind which all the immense estates of the Livingston family were, then, very securely situated—and for that of the State, what he, therein, elaborately described; although he must have known, when it was written, that General Washington could not, possibly, comply with a single one of the many requests which that letter contained.[4]

In the same connection, and in order that the reader may understand the temper of the great body of the people, beyond the limits of Duchess and Westchester-counties, we find room for the reply of the Colonel commanding the Militia of Orange-county, below the mountains, to the requisition which was made, by the Committee of Safety, for men enough to protect that portion of the western bank of the river, to which reference has been made. It was in these words: "We are in daily expectation of "their" [*the ships*] "proceeding up the river; and I am "sorry to inform the Committee of Safety that, should "they attempt to land with one barge, I cannot com-"mand a force sufficient to prevent their penetrating "the country. I have exerted myself to muster the "Militia, but have not been able to raise a guard of "more than thirty-eight men of my Regiment, at one "time, at Nyack.[5] The wood-cutters employed by "order of General Heath have been with me, but "have received orders to proceed in cutting wood for "the Army; and I have not, at present, but eleven "men to guard the shore between Verdudigo Hook "and Stony Point.[6] In this situation, I leave the "Committee of Safety to determine what can be ex-"pected from me, in a way of opposition.

"My whole Regiment consists of but three hundred "men: most of them are without arms, they having "been taken for the Continental troops. Most of my "men refuse to attend the service, though repeatedly

[1] *General Washington to the Continental Congress*, "HEIGHTS OF HARLEM, 7 October, 1776," postscript dated, "October 9th;" *the same to General Schuyler*, "HEAD-QUARTERS, HARLEM HEIGHTS, October 10, "1776."

[2] *Lieutenant-colonel Tilghman to the Convention*, "HEAD-QUARTERS, "HARLEM-HEIGHTS, October 10, 1776;" *Colonel Sargent to General Heath*, "Half-past two o'clock at night, DOBB'S FERRY, October 10, 1776;" * *Colonel Ann Hawkes Hay to the Convention*, "HAVERSTRAW, October 10, "1776;"

* It is very evident that this letter was written at half-past two o'clock in the *morning* of the tenth of October, since it was received, at King's Bridge, and answered, by General Heath on that day; and the Colonel and his command, pursuant to *Orders* thus conveyed, countermarched to King's Bridge, where they arrived "At Night," of the same day.—(*General Heath's Orders to Colonel Sargent*, "KINGS BRIDGE, October 10, 1776;" David How's *Diary*, 10 October, 1776; *Memoir of General Heath*, 150.)

[3] *Journal of the Committee of Safety*, "Thursday afternoon, Octor. 10, "1776."

[4] *Robert R. Livingston to General Washington*, "FISHKILL, 12 October, "1776."

[5] As the ships were anchored off Nyack as well as off Tarrytown, these villages being exactly opposite, the former on the western and the latter on the eastern bank of the river, and as two boats' crews had made an attempt to go ashore, at Nyack, on the preceding Sunday, it will be seen why the Colonel mentioned Nyack, especially, in his despatch to the Committee of Safety.

[6] The shore-line thus described includes the entire western bank of that portion of the Hudson-river which is known as Haverstraw Bay, extending from a short distance above Nyack to within a short distance from the southernmost entrance into the Highlands.

"summoned. Many reasons are assigned for this "desertion of the service, such as, that the troops last "raised were, by the Convention, expressly levied for "the purpose of protecting the shore; that this in-"duced many of their people to enlist, but they have "been drawn off from the immediate defence of their "wives, children, and property, to guard the eastern "shore of the river, contrary to their expectations. "Others declare that if they leave their business, "their families must starve, as they have all their "Corn and Buckwheat to secure, and have been so "called off, during the Summer, by the public "troubles, as not to have been able to put in the "ground, any Winter Grain, and would, therefore, as "leave die by the sword as by famine. A third set, "and the most numerous, declare that the Congress "have rejected all overtures for a reconciliation, in-"consistent with Independency; that all they desire "is peace, liberty, and safety; and that if they can "procure that, they are contented."[1]

It will be seen, from this official statement, that there were other Militia than that of Westchester-county on whom "no reliance at all could be placed," in that hour of extreme danger; and, when taken into consideration, in connection with the facts that the Counties of Richmond, Kings, Queens, and Suffolk had returned to their allegiance to the King; that Duchess-county was in open and armed opposition to the Convention, and was kept in subjection only by the occupation of the County and the support of the few friends of the Convention who lived there, by five hundred armed men, drawn from Connecticut; and that the Manor of Livingston, including the whole of the lower portion of Albany-county, was almost entirely "disaffected," Colonel Hay's exposition of the temper of the farmers of Orange-county very clearly established the fact that "disaffection" was not peculiar to the farmers of Westchester-county; and that the *Declaration of Independence* had not been received with any favor, by the greater number of the inhabitants of New York.

The purposes of the enemy, in sending the *Phœnix* and her consorts up the Hudson-river and in anchoring them off Tarrytown, as we have seen, were variously interpreted by General Washington and the Committee of Safety; and they have continued to receive the scattered attention of those who have written on the subject, to this day.[2] But, while the surmises of General Washington and those of the Convention were thrown out before the ships had reached the anchorage-ground to which they had been ordered and, therefore, before either their destination or the purposes for which they had been ordered to move up to Tarrytown were definitely made known to any one, except to their own Officers, there is no evidence whatever, in the sub-sequent conduct of those ships, to give the slightest weight to any of those earlier surmises, no matter by whom originated; and the direction in which the alarm of the Commander-in-chief and the Convention trended, in the light afforded by immediately subsequent events, was, certainly, not the right one—the ships certainly made no attempt to renew the previously unsuccessful attempt to give countenance and support, for military purposes, to the disaffected farmers of Westchester-county: they certainly made no attempt whatever to seize the forts in the Highlands and to occupy the water communication through the Highlands: and there is not the slightest evidence that they effected or attempted to effect combinations with anybody, on shore, for any purpose whatever. Had their purpose been to cut off the supplies of the American Army, as some have supposed and stated—a project which would have been unnecessary, if the American Army was to be obliged to abandon its strong position, near Kingsbridge, in order to prevent the enemy from falling on its rear—the ships would not have anchored at so great a distance from the American lines; nor would they have chosen, as their station, the widest part of the river, at that place quite three miles wide, of which two-thirds or more are shoal-water, over which the small river-craft could pass and re-pass, with impunity; while, within four miles, equally good anchorage grounds could have been found, equally safe from interference from the Americans, less exposed to the heavy winds of the season, which would have required not more than one-half the extent of guard-duty, and, at the same time, which would have been equally effective, for the purpose named. Had the purpose been, as others have supposed, to have obstructed the retreat of the American Army and the removal of its stores and heavy guns, by water, it is equally strange that the place which was designated for the anchorage of the ships was situated not far from ten miles above the American lines, within which General Washington held an

[1] *Colonel Ann Hawkes Hay to the Convention*, "HAVERSTRAW, October "15, 1776."

[2] Marshall, (*Life of George Washington*, Ed. Philadelphia: 1804, ii., 495, 496,) very accurately, stated the object of the movement was to secure to General Howe the possession of the North-river above Kingsbridge, without, however, stating more than that. Sparks, (*Life of George Washington*, Ed. Boston: 1842, 194,) said they "secured a free passage to "the Highlands, thereby preventing any supplies, from coming to the "American Army, by water." Hildreth, (*History of the United States*, iii., 154,) said, only, they "cut off all supplies from the country, South "and West of that river," the Hudson. Bancroft, (*History of the United States*, original edition, ix., 174; *the same*, centenary edition, v., 439,) referred to nothing else than to the *Phœnix* and the *Roebuck* and the tenders; and, very cautiously, for reasons which are not unknown to us, he said nothing whatever concerning the purposes of the expedition. Irving, (*Life of Washington*, Ed. New York: 1856, ii., 367-37[illegible],) in the most carefully prepared description of all, with a grave error in his description of the passage of the ships through the obstructions, and another in making General Washington do what was done by General Heath, recited all the surmises of the inhabitants and others, concerning the object of the movement, without pretending to offer any of his own.

No other writer of the history of that period has noticed the subject, notwithstanding its great importance.

undisputed line of communication with New Jersey, protected by the guns of both Fort Washington and Fort Lee, over which, if adversity had overtaken him, he could have securely retreated. For these reasons, and with the knowledge which all the events of that period in which that particular Squadron was concerned, has imparted, we have seen no reason for concurring with those who have already written concerning the purposes of General Howe, in the removal of the Squadron which had covered the left flank of his lines, from its anchorage, off Bloomingdale, to a distant anchorage, off Tarrytown, when he had no further use for it, at the former station, and expected to make it useful, for the same purpose, in the latter; and, at the same time, from the best evidence which we have been able to control, we have formed an opinion, concerning those purposes, which differs from all those to which we have referred and of all of which we have heard. That opinion may be thus stated: when preparations were being made by General Howe, for the military occupation of the City of New York, before any movement for that purpose was actually made, these ships were moved up the Hudson-river, on the opposite side of the island, for the purpose, as General Howe subsequently informed the Home Government, of drawing the attention of the Americans to that side, while the real operations were to be made on the other side. In short, the movement, on that occasion, was, primarily, a feint; but it had served, also, to command the lower portion of the river; to prevent the retreating Americans from removing their stores or heavy guns, from the City to Kingsbridge, by water; and, therefore, to throw into the hands of the Royal Army, both stores and guns which the Americans could ill-afford to lose. Subsequent to the establishment of the former, in the City of New York, the Squadron, at its anchorage, off Bloomingdale, had effectually covered the left flank of the enemy's lines, which, without such a protection, would have been negligently exposed to the well-known enterprise of the Americans; and, as far as we have seen it, there is not the slightest evidence that the Squadron had been engaged in any other service. At the time now under notice, General Howe was again preparing to move his great command, at that time, by way of the Sound, into Westchester-county; and he did no more, concerning that Squadron, in that connection, than he had done, in the former instance, when he had moved that command from Long Island to the City of New York—he caused it to be moved further up the river, evidently, again, in order "to draw the enemy's" [*the Americans*'] "attention to that side," while he and his command should effect a landing, on the other side of the County, with lesser opposition and difficulty; and it is not improbable, in view of the recognized purposes of General Howe, in proposing to move his command into Westchester-county, that it was expected, also, to cover that flank of the Army, in whatever operations it should become engaged, within that County. We believe that these were the only purposes for which the Squadron was moved up the river; and we also believe that, for the purpose of a feint, the movement was, again, an entire success: because of the subsequent movements of the two Armies, it was not required for any other purpose.

Having detached two Brigades of British and one Brigade of Hessian troops, the whole under the command of Lieutenant-general Earl Percy, to occupy the exterior lines, on the high grounds to the southward of the Harlem-plain, for the protection of the City of New York,[1] and another Brigade of British troops to garrison the City itself,[2] "all previous arrange-"ments, having been made," early on the morning of Saturday, the twelfth of October, the first detachment of the forces designated for that purpose, under the personal command of General Howe, embarked, at Kip's-bay,[3] in the City of New York, in flat-boats, batteaux, etc.; and, having passed through Hell-gate, landed—the *Carysfort*, frigate, having been so placed that she could cover the descent—about nine o'clock in the morning, on Throgg's-neck, in the Borough Town of Westchester, in Westchester-county.[4]

It was an exceedingly foggy morning;[5] and, from the fact that General Washington made no allusion to the enemy's movement, in letters written by him, on that day, respectively, to the President of the Congress and to Governor Cooke, of Rhode Island, notwithstanding his Headquarters, in the elegant mansion of Colonel Roger Morris, more recently owned

[1] *General Howe to Lord George Germaine*, "NEW YORK, November 30, "1776."

[2] General Howe made no mention of a third Brigade of British troops having been left, to garrison the City; but common sense tells us there must have been such a Garrison, within the thickly settled portions of the City; and Captain Hall, (*History of the Civil War in America*, i., 203,) and Stedman, (*History of the American War*, i., 210,) both of them officers of the Royal Army, have left records of the fact.

[3] Captain Hall, (*History of the Civil War in America*, i., 203,) said the troops were embarked, for this movement, in *Turtle*-bay; but, inasmuch as the naval portions of the movement were made under the personal superintendence of Admiral Lord Howe, we have preferred his statement, in his despatch to the Admiralty, ("EAGLE, OFF NEW-YORK, November "23, 1776.") that the embarkation was at *Kip's* bay.

[4] *Admiral Lord Howe to Mr. Stephens, Secretary of the Admiralty*, "EAGLE, "OFF NEW-YORK, November 23, 1776;" *General Howe to Lord George Germaine*, "NEW-YORK, November 30, 1776;" *General Washington to General Heath*, "HEADQUARTERS, October 12, 1776;" *the same to the Congress*, "HEIGHTS OF HARLEM, 12 October, 1776," postscript dated, "October 13th;" *Diary of David Hosack*, October 12, 1776; *General Washington to Governor Cooke*, "HEADQUARTERS, HARLEM HEIGHTS, October 12, "1776;" postscript dated "October 13th;" *Colonel Smallwood to the Maryland Convention*, "CAMP OF THE MARYLAND REGULARS, HEADQUAR-"TERS, October 12, 1776;" *Extract of a letter from Harlem*, in The Pennsylvania Evening Post, Volume 2, Number 271, PHILADELPHIA, Tuesday, October 15, 1776; *the same*, in The Pennsylvania Journal, No. 1797, PHILADELPHIA, Wednesday, October 16, 1776; [Hall's] *History of the Civil War in America*, i., 203; Stedman's *History of the American War*, i., 210; Gordon's *History of the American Revolution*, iii., 336; *Memoir of General Heath*, 70; etc.

[5] *Admiral Lord Howe to Mr. Stephens, Secretary to the Admiralty*, "EAGLE, OFF NEW-YORK, November 23, 1776;" *General Howe to Lord George Germaine*, "NEW YORK, 30 November, 1776;" [Hall's] *History of the Civil War in America*, i., 203.

by Madame Jumel,[1] commanded a fine view of the East-river and Sound; and because the intelligence of the movement which he first received, was conveyed to him, by express, from General Heath, after the landing had been made,[2] it may be reasonably supposed that the movement of the Royal Army, into Westchester-county, was unknown to him, until after it had been accomplished; that the left flank of the American Army had been successfully turned, a second time, without his knowledge; and that the latter was placed, again, by reason of that successful movement of the enemy, in such a critical situation that its very existence was threatened—it is noteworthy, also, that if a dense fog had served to secure the escape of the American Army from what appeared to have threatened its entire destruction, at Brooklyn, a similarly dense fog, on the occasion now under notice, had afforded a similar advantage to the Royal Army, in its effort to recover the great military advantages which it had lost, on the former occasion.

During the afternoon of the same day, [*October* 12, 1776,] the second detachment of the Royal Army passed Hell-gate, in forty-two sail of vessels, including nine ships; and it was, also, safely landed.[3]

The naval portion of that very important movement was performed under the personal supervision of Admiral Lord Howe, assisted by Commodore Hotham; and the assistance of most of the Captains of the Fleet and that of the naval officers, in general, which were freely given, secured, for that difficult movement, the most complete success, the only loss sustained having been that of an artillery-boat, with three six-pounders and three men, which was upset and sunk by the rapidity of the current,[4] probably in Hell-gate.

General Howe, notwithstanding his successful occupation of Westchester-county, was made the object of much censure, because of his movement to Throgg's-neck, first, because of the danger to which the City of New York was exposed by the withdrawal of so large a portion of the Army; and the temptation which was offered to General Washington to make a dash, in that direction, instead of moving the American Army into Westchester-county; in which latter case the three Brigades commanded by General Lord Percy would have been seriously imperiled; and, second, because he had landed on Throgg's-neck, which was really an island, instead of on the mainland, where none of the difficulties to which he was exposed, on the Neck, would have been encountered.[6] But, if the General noticed the first of these criticisms, we have seen no mention of it; and, in answer to the second, without pretending to offer any further explanation, although it is understood that he could easily have done so,[7] he said, before the Committee of the House of Commons, who was considering his conduct, as Commander-in-chief of the Army, that the landing at Pell's-neck instead of at Throgg's-neck, "would have been an imprudent measure, as it "could not have been executed without much un-"necessary risk."[8]

Throgg's-neck is a peninsula, on the eastern border of Westchester-county, which stretches upwards of two miles into the Sound. It was separated from the mainland by a narrow creek and a marsh, and was surrounded by water, every high-tide. At the time of which we write, a bridge across the creek, connecting with a causeway across the marsh, afforded means for communication between the mainland and the Neck; besides which, however, the upper end of the creek was fordable, at low-water.[9] As early as the third of October, General Heath, who commanded those detachments from the Army who were in Westchester-county, had reconnoitred his position, accompanied by Colonel

[1] The fine old mansion still occupies its place, with few, if any, alterations, on the high grounds forming the southern bank of the Harlem-river, near One hundred and sixty-ninth-street a little below the High-bridge of the Croton-aqueduct. Madame Jumel, who was also the widow of Aaron Burr, has been dead, many years; and the right to the ownership of the property has been bitterly contested, in the Courts; but the old house remains—and long may it remain.

[2] *Colonel Harrison's reply, under General Washington's instructions*, "HEAD-QUARTERS, October 12, 1776;" *Colonel Ewing to the Maryland Council of Safety*, "CAMP NEAR HARLEM, October 13, 1776."

[3] *General Washington to the Congress*, "HEIGHTS OF HARLEM, 12 Octo-"ber, 1776;" postscript, dated "October 13th;" *the same to General Ward*, "HEAD-QUARTERS, HARLEM HEIGHTS, October 13, 1776;" *Extract of a Letter from Harlem*, dated October 13, in *The Pennsylvania Evening Post*, Volume 2, Number 271, PHILADELPHIA, Tuesday, October 15, 1776; *the same*, in *The Pennsylvania Journal*, No. 1767, PHILADELPHIA, Wednesday, October 16, 1776; *Memoirs of General Heath*, 71.

[4] *Admiral Lord Howe to Mr. Stephens, Secretary to the Admiralty*, "EAGLE, OFF NEW-YORK, November 23, 1776;" *General Howe to Lord George Germaine*, "NEW-YORK, 30 November, 1776;" [Hall's] *History of the Civil War in America*, i., 202.

[5] *Annual Register for* 1776, *History of Europe*, 176*.

[6] [Hall's] *History of the Civil War in America*, i., 203; Stedman's *History of the American War*, i., 210; etc.

It is very evident, from indirect questions put to the Government's witness against Sir William Howe, General Robertson, before a Committee of the House of Commons, on the fourteenth of June, 1779, that Lord George Germaine was also inclined to criticise the occupation of Throgg's-neck, adversely.

[7] It is said that the place for the landing of the troops was entirely entrusted to the naval officers, by whom Throgg's-neck was selected, because of the unfitness of Pell's-neck, for that purpose; and a glance at the official Chart of the Coast Survey, will satisfy any one of the wisdom displayed in the choice—the shallowness of the water, elsewhere, would have prevented the co-operation of the larger vessels of every class; and, certainly, the landing of the troops at Pell's-neck could not have been covered by any vessel of force sufficient for such a purpose, without which no prudent officer would have attempted a landing, anywhere.

But General Sir Henry Clinton has left a testimony on this subject, which disposes of every cavil. On the margin of his own copy of Stedman's *History of the American War*, (i. 211,) he wrote these words: "It "had been proposed to Sir William Howe that the troops should have "been marched to Harlem Point" [*Horen's Hook, at the mouth of the Harlem River, opposite Hell-gate,*] "there met by the boats, passed to City "Orchard" [*City-island?*] thence to Mill's Creek," [*New Rush Re-harbor,*] "and Rochelle. This was overruled; and the above move to Frog's "Point took place. *Lord* Howe objected to Mill's Creek, under an idea "that it would not be safe for ships to lay there."

[8] *Speech of Sir William Howe before a Committee of the House of Commons*, April 29, 1779.

[9] Although Throgg's-neck is only a short distance from where we have lived during the past twenty-seven years, we have never been on the ground; and we have depended, for what we have said of it, on General Heath, (*Memoirs*, 67,) and on our unwearied friend, William H. De Lancey, Esq., who is familiar with that portion of the County.

Hand, of the First Regiment of Continental Foot; and, in doing so, he had "taken a view" of the causeway and the bridge, between the mainland and the Neck, at the western end of which a large quantity of cord-wood had been piled, "as advantageously situ-"ated to cover a party defending the pass, as if con-"structed for the very purpose," as he has stated. Considering it possible that the enemy might make a lodgment on Throgg's-neck, the General immediately ordered Colonel Hand to detail one of his best Subalterns and twenty-five picked men, to that pass, "as "their alarm-post, at all times," with orders, if the enemy should effect a landing on the Neck, immediately to take up the planks of the bridge; to oppose the movement of the enemy, to the mainland; and, in case the fire of the detachment should appear to be insufficient to check the advance of the enemy, over the causeway, to set fire to a tide-mill which stood on the mainland, at the western extremity of the bridge.[1] He also ordered Colonel Hand to detail another party to guard the fording-place, at the head of the creek; and to reinforce both these parties, if the enemy should effect a landing on the Neck; and he promised the Colonel that he should be properly supported. Colonel Hand carefully obeyed all these Orders, we are told;[2] and the only lines of communication with the mainland, from Throgg's-neck, were thus carefully guarded, when General Howe and his command debarked on that isolated ground.

When the enemy had effected a landing, on the Neck, in the morning, his advance pushed forward, towards the causeway, for the purpose of occupying that line of communication with the mainland; but the detachment whom Colonel Hand had sent for the protection of it, had taken up the flooring of the bridge, agreeably to the General's orders; and it also opened a fire on the enemy, with its rifles, compelling him to fall back to the main body. A similar movement of the enemy against the fording-place, at the head of the creek, met with a similar repulse; and no further movements, toward the mainland, appear to have been made; and, by way of precaution, a breast-work was thrown up, on the Neck, by the Royal troops, to cover the approach, by way of the causeway.[3]

Besides the despatch of an express to Head-quarters, with intelligence of the enemy's movements, to which reference has been made,[4] General Heath reinforced the guard, at the bridge, by ordering Colonel Prescott, the hero of Bunker's-hill, with his Regiment, and Captain-lieutenant Bryant, of the Artillery, with a three-pounder, to march to that place; and Colonel Graham, of the New York Line, with his Regiment, and Lieutenant Jackson, of the Artillery, with a six-pounder, was ordered to march to the head of the creek, for the reinforcement of the guard who had been posted at that place. Besides the throwing up of an earthwork, opposite the western end of the causeway, the addition of the Brigade commanded by General McDougal to General Heath's command, and an irregular, scattering fire which was indulged in, by both parties, nothing further was done by either of the Armies, during that day.[5]

When the intelligence of the movement of the greater portion of the Royal Army into Westchester-county, reached Head-quarters, General Washington appears to have given way to despair, in view of his powerlessness, and to have become despondent; although he appears to have really believed that the movement was not anything else than a feint. It is true that he ordered every Regiment who was under his immediate command, to be under arms, there, that it might be ready to act as occasion might require; that he authorized General Heath to make such disposition of the troops, in Westchester-county, including two Regiments of Militia who were posted near Kings-bridge, as he should think proper; and that he begged and trusted that every possible opposition would be given to the enemy, adding "God bless and lead you "on to Victory;"[6] but it was hardly consistent with his duty, as Commander-in-chief of the Army, at that important moment, to remain at Head-quarters; to give the absolute command of all the troops which were before the enemy to an Officer, excellent though he evidently was, as a subordinate, whose experience

[1] We are indebted to our friend, Edward F. de Lancey, Esq., of Mamaroneck, for the following account of that old Mill:

"The Mill and dam, at Westchester, were built by Colonel Caleb "Heathcote, the first Mayor of the Borough-Town of Westchester, at his "own expense. It stood till February, 1875, when it was accidentally "burnt. The outside had been renewed, from time to time: but the frame "was the original one, of massive hewn timber; and at the time of its "destruction, it was the oldest Mill, in Westchester-county, and, probably, "in the State.

"By the original Grant to Colonel Heathcote, the inhabitants reserved "the right to have their own grain ground, free. This was afterwards "commuted to a toll, payable to the present 'town' of Westchester, "which the Town enjoyed, as a source of revenue, till the Mill was burnt; "and the right to which it still retains, if the Mill shall be rebuilt."

[2] *Memoirs of General Heath*, 68.

[3] *Memoirs of General Heath*, 70.

[4] Vide page 231, ante.

[5] *Memoirs of General Heath*, 70.

[6] *General Washington, by his Secretary, Colonel Robert H. Harrison, to General Heath*, "HEAD-QUARTERS, 12 October, 1776."

In the same connection, it is a noticeable fact that the *General Orders* of the day and there were no *After Orders*, on that eventful twelfth of October, made no mention whatever of the movement of the enemy or of the disposition of the American troops; that they were written, entirely, in only three short lines—(*General Orders*, "HEAD QUARTERS, HARLEM "HEIGHTS, October 12, 1776")—that General Washington, on that day, appears to have completed none of his letters which were unfinished when General Heath's express arrived at Head-quarters; and that no allusion whatever was made, by him, to the enemy's occupation of Westchester-county nor to any movement of his own command, consequent on that occupation, in anything which he wrote or ordered to be written on that day, which we have found, except in that note, written by his Secretary, under his own eye, to General Heath, of which mention has been made in the text. As stated in the text, he certainly rode over to the village of Westchester and to the head of the creek, towards night, and looked at the preparations which had been made, at those places, to check any movement which the enemy should make; but, beyond that informal inspection, he evidently did nothing whatever, as the Commander in chief of the American Army

was so very limited; to transfer to that officer the entire responsibility of the opposition which was to be made against the powerful enemy who was actually moving against the very existence of the young States, not yet confederated and very poorly connected even by the ties of a common danger; and to give to him his parting if not his farewell blessing; and nothing else than the bitterness of despair, the hopelessness which seemed to overwhelm all other traits of his character, could, possibly, have produced such unusual, such remarkable, such extremely dangerous results. It is, indeed, stated that he rode over to the village of Westchester and to the head of the creek, late in the afternoon; but no one has pretended that he issued an Order or did any other act which the Commander-in-chief, under such peculiar circumstances, might have been expected to have done.[1]

When General Greene, who was at Fort Constitution, as Fort Lee was then called, heard of the movement of the enemy, he wrote to General Washington, stating that three Brigades, at that time in New Jersey, were in readiness to be sent over the river, for the reinforcement of the main Army; and he hoped, if the force which was then on the eastern side of the river was insufficient to repel the enemy, that those Brigades, and he with them, might be ordered to cross the river, for its reinforcement, during the latter part of the coming night, as the enemy's shipping might move up, from below, and impede, if they should not totally stop, the troops from crossing.[2] But the proffered help was not accepted;[3] and Greene, notwithstanding his honorable anxiety, appears to have remained in New Jersey, without having received any answer to either his offer of help or his reasonable enquiries.

But the interregnum continued only during a few hours; and, gradually, the reason of the Commander-in-chief resumed its sway, his mental and physical strength was restored, and he was, again, the responsible head of the American Army. During the evening, as we have already seen, the Brigade commanded by General McDougal was ordered to move for the reinforcement of General Heath's command;[4] and, with that *Order*, the record of that great day in the history of Westchester-county was closed.

On the following morning, [*Sunday, October* 13, 1776,] General Washington became almost satisfied that the enemy's movement was not a feint; that his main body was on Throgg's-neck; and that he "had "in view the prosecution of his original plan, that of "getting in the rear of the Americans and of cutting "off their communication with the country."[5] That change in the General's opinion, as far as there was a change, appears to have been produced by the fact that General Howe had made no attempt to make a landing at Morrisania, as the former had supposed he would have done; and, the first time, he "thought it "would be advisable" to reinforce and protect the troops who had been, for more than twenty-four hours, guarding the two passes through which the enemy could open communications with the mainland; and he "recommended" the posting of small bodies of observation, at Pell's-point, at the mouth of Hutchinson's-river, at Hunt's-point, and at Willett's-point, without, however, giving an Order, for the execution of either of these.[6] At the same time, he strengthened the force already in Westchester-county, by moving the Brigade which had formerly been commanded by General Heath, for its support.[7]

He also ordered Colonel Tash, with his Regiment of New Hampshire Militia, then at the White Plains, to march to Fishkill, "with all possible despatch," for the assistance of the Committee of Safety, in holding the disaffected in check;[8] he called a meeting of the General Officers, at noon, "at or near King's "Bridge,"—as "we are strangers to a suitable place," it was left for General Heath to determine where he would have them meet;[9] and, finally, in these ringing sentences, he attempted to arouse the Army to a sense

---

[1] "Our men, who are posted on the passes, seemed to be in great spirits, when I left them last night." (*Letter to the President of the Congress*, "HEIGHTS OF HARLEM, 12 October, 1776," postscript, dated, "October 13th.")

[2] *General Greene to General Washington*, "FORT CONSTITUTION, October "12, five o'clock, 1776."

[3] We are not insensible that the General's grandson has said that "part of the troops were called over, but Greene was not," (Greene's *Life of Nathanael Greene*, Edit. New York: 1867, i., 235;) but he gave no authority for the statement, and we have found none; and we prefer to believe that the proffered help was not accepted, *at that time*, although some portions of General Greene's command were moved into Westchester-county, within a day or two, and after the Commander-in-chief had recovered from his temporary despondency and had resumed the command of the Army.

[4] *Colonel Smallwood to the Maryland Convention*, "CAMP OF THE MARYLAND REGULARS, HEAD-QUARTERS, October 12, 1776," postscript, signed by Chris'r Richmond, Adjutant, and dated "Sunday, October 13, 1776;" "*Colonel Ewing to the Maryland Council of Safety*, "CAMP NEAR HARLEM, "October 13, 1776;" *Memoirs of General Heath*, 71

[5] *General Washington to General Ward*, "HEAD-QUARTERS, HARLEM "HEIGHTS, October 13, 1776."

[6] "I beg leave to inform you that his Excellency (as the enemy did not "attempt landing at *Morrisania*, this morning,) thinks it would be advisable to send a stronger force towards the two passes, near the enemy, "where our men were posted, yesterday, and also to throw up the "works for their cover and defence. He also recommends strongly to "your attention, the keeping a good look out at Pell's-point, at the mouth "of Eastchester-creek, and at Hunt's and Willett's-points, for the sake of "gaining intelligence, these posts to be regarded as look outs only." (*Colonel William Grayson, A.D.C. to General Heath*, "HEAD-QUARTERS, "October 13, 1776.")

[7] *Memoirs of General Heath*, 71,

[8] *General Washington to Colonel Tash*, "HEAD-QUARTERS, October 13, "1776;" *Colonel E. H. Hawkins to the Congress*, "HEAD-QUARTERS, "HARLEM HEIGHTS, October 14, 1776."

It is proper for us to say, in this place, that the Committee desired only two Companies; and ordered the remainder of the Regiment back to Peekskill. (*Colonel Thomas Tash to the New Hampshire Committee of Safety*, "PEAKSKILL, IN CORTLANDT MANOR, October 26, 1776.")

[9] *Colonel Joseph Reed to General Heath*, "October 13, 1776."

It was stated in Colonel Reed's note that "it being necessary, since the "late movement of the enemy, to form some plan" of operations for the American Army, it is only reasonable to suppose the General Officers were called together, for an interchange of opinions, on that subject. The Council was evidently convened at General Heath's quarters, (*Memoirs of General Heath*, 71;) but nothing appears to have been done, because, it is said, of the absence of Generals Lee, Greene, and Mercer.

of its duty, to the country and to the world: "As the "enemy seem, now, to be endeavouring to strike some "stroke, before the close of the Campaign," were his words, "the General most earnestly conjures both Offi- "cers and men, if they have any love for their country "and concern for its liberties and regard to the safety "of their parents, wives, children, and countrymen, "that they will act with bravery and spirit, becoming "the cause in which they are engaged; and to encour- "age and animate them so to do, there is every ad- "vantage of ground and situation, so that, if we do "not conquer, it must be our own faults. How much "better will it be to die honourably, fighting in the "field, than to return home, covered with shame and "disgrace, even if the cruelty of the enemy should "allow you to return! A brave and gallant beha- "viour, for a few days, and patience, under some lit- "tle hardships, may save our country and enable us "to go into Winter-quarters with safety and honour."[1]

On the morning of the fourteenth of October, General Heath, with all the Generals under his command, reconnoitred the enemy, on Throgg's-neck;[2] and, soon afterwards, General Washington, accompanied by the Generals of the Army who were at Head-quarters, also visited all the posts, beyond Kingsbridge, and the several passes and roadways which led from Throgg's-neck and from the adjacent Necks, into the country,[3] acquainting himself, as far as he could do so, by personal reconnaissance, with the strength and position and purposes of the enemy; with the character and condition of the outlets, from Throgg's-neck and from the other similar, but lesser, Necks, in that vicinity, from which the enemy might incline to move into the interior of the County; with the capabilities, for defensive purposes, which those outlets severally possessed; and with the necessities, for military purposes, which each of these several subjects presented, for his attention.

During the same day, [*October* 14,] General Lee reached Head-quarters, on his return from the South; and the command of all the troops in Westchester-county, then the greater portion of the Army, was given to him, with the request, however, that he would not assume the command until he should have made himself acquainted with the different portions of the post, their circumstances, and the arrangements of the troops which had been made;[4] and, in the *General Orders* of the day, the Commander-in-chief ordered Colonel Bailey's Regiment to join General Clinton's Brigade, and Colonel Lippet's Regiment to join General McDougal's Brigade—each of them "to take their tents and cooking utensils, "and to lose no time;"—the two Connecticut Regiments, commanded, respectively, by Colonel Storrs and Major Graves, were ordered "to be in readiness "to march into Westchester, at a moment's warning;" and Generals Putnam and Spencer, the former commanding Heard's, Beall's, and Weedon's Brigades, and the latter commanding Lord Stirling's, Wadsworth's, and Fellows's Brigades, were ordered to remain on Harlem Heights and to continue the works of entrenchment thereon, General Putnam on all those proposed defensive works which were above Head-quarters, including those of Fort Washington:[5] those below Head-quarters, immediately in front of the enemy's works, which were occupied by Lieutenant-general the Earl of Percy and three Brigades, having been assigned to General Spencer.[6]

As General Heath was continued in the command of all the troops within Westchester-county, until further orders, notwithstanding the assignment of General Lee to the same command, the former instructed General Nixon, who had been ordered from New Jersey, with his Brigade, to "have the troops "which have marched, this day, to the eastward of "the Bridge, by Williams's,"[7] [*Williams's-bridge,*] "completely ready to turn out, in case the enemy "should make an attack, that night;" instructing him, at the same time, "should the attack be made

[1] *General Orders*, "HEAD-QUARTERS, HARLEM HEIGHTS, October 13, "1776."

[2] *Memoirs of General Heath*, 71.

[3] *Colonel Harrison to the Congress*, "HEAD-QUARTERS, HARLEM HEIGHTS, "October 14, 1776;" *the same to Peter R. Livingston*, "HEAD-QUARTERS, "HARLEM HEIGHTS, October 14, 1776;" *Memoirs of General Heath*, 71.

[4] *Memoirs of General Heath*, 71.

There is nothing which indicated the general consciousness of the helplessness of the country, at the time of which we write, as much as the general dependence of the country, as well as that of the Army, on General Charles Lee, an officer of large military pretentions; the ambitious leader of that party, in the Congress and elsewhere—mainly New Englanders—who was inclined to depreciate, if not to officially embarrass, General Washington; and the self-appointed and very willing and very unscrupulous critic of everything and everybody, unless of himself and of those who were pandering to his unholy ambition and applauding even his scurrility. He wielded a very glib, but a very poisonous, tongue, and a sharp and venomous pen, both of which were ready for immediate use, whenever his passions or his interests required their co-operation. He was generally haughty, in his demeanor; he was always unprincipled, for good; he never ceased to be avaricious, even to meanness and dishonesty. A huckster of his own political and military opinions and associations, he was never contented with the prices which his wares commanded in the market of the world; and, after he had disgusted even his own party and had become, himself, disgusted with all mankind, he died, "unwept, unhonored, and unsung."

The country has had other men of straw whom it has also grasped, in its hours of great anxiety and great danger, almost counterparts of that on whom the Army and the country leaned, so confidently and so heavily, from early in 1775 until the Summer of 1778: and just as the broken reed of that early period pierced the hand which leaned on it, so have these latter pretenders, these latter selfish and unpatriotic tools of unscrupulous and designing men, wounded those whose confidence they had secured, and brought shame and dishonor on the country which had petted them.

[5] The position assigned to Major-general Putnam, not immediately in front of the enemy, but, in the rear, where he could do no more than oversee the construction of certain *specified* defensive works, is peculiarly noteworthy—the disaster on Long Island was too distinctly remembered to allow him to be posted, again, where he could possibly do any harm.

[6] *General Orders*, "HEAD-QUARTERS, HARLEM HEIGHTS, October 14, "1776."

[7] We have not found any other description of these troops than what General Heath and David How wrote concerning them: the former saying, "two or three Brigades have moved, this day, beyond Wil- "liams's;" (*Letter to Colonel Sargent*, "KING'S BRIDGE, October 14, "1776;") and the latter, "14. There has been two Brigades March'd by "hear This Day Towards Throgg's point." (*Diary*, "October 14, 177

"towards Frog's Point," to "endeavour to support "the Regiments that are posted at the passes, there;" "should the attack be made at or near East Chester "landing," to "make the best disposition of his "troops and repel the enemy;" and if any new movement of the enemy should be discovered, "to "send notice thereof, immediately, by one of the "Light-horsemen." General Heath also informed General Nixon "that a guard was absolutely necessary at "Rodman's-point," [*the same as Pell's-point, on the opposite side of the Hutchinson's-river, from Throgg's-neck,*] "next to East-Chester-creek." He said that Colonel How was near the landing-place, "with a "Regiment of Militia;" but it was evident that not enough was known of Colonel How's military qualifications for the command of so important a position; and General Nixon was directed to make inquiries on the subject.[1]

While the military authorities were thus engaged in preparing to meet the enemy, in arms, whenever the latter should endeavor to move from the Neck on which he was then quietly encamped, the Convention of New York, by its Committee of Safety, as we have already stated in our review of the proceedings of that Convention,[2] as soon as information could have possibly reached it, that the enemy had moved towards Westchester-county, provided for the immediate disposition of all the Cattle, Horses, Hogs, Sheep, Grain, Straw, and Hay, on the well-cultivated farms throughout that County, in order that the enemy should not secure them for his Commissariat;[3] and the careful reader may gather from that decided action of the Committee of Safety, how completely desolated all that flourishing County must have become, before that enemy secured a foothold on the main-land—indeed, before that foothold had been secured, all that portion of the County which was below Tarrytown, the White Plains, and Rye had, probably, been generally stripped of the various agricultural productions of that season, excepting only the Potatoes, the Buckwheat, and the Corn; and, of the Live-stock, of every description, it is scarcely probable that any remained, within that portion of the County.

In connection with this notice of the removal of the Live-stock and Crops, we may properly mention that, very largely, the inhabitants of those portions of the County which were likely to be exposed to the depredations of either of the two Armies—and one of these Armies was quite as bad as the other, in the work of plunder and devastation and outrage—removed from their several rural homes, with as many of their effects as they could take with them, to places of supposed greater safety;[4] and it is scarcely probable that, in all the lower Towns of the County, in which the tramp of armed men was soon to be heard, many of the inhabitants remained, unless, here and there, where the head of a family, accompanied by a faithful negro, lingered on the deserted homestead, in order that the property which could not be removed might not be left entirely uncared for.

The Convention was also mindful of the danger to which the records of the City and County of New York, as well as those of the Borough of Westchester and those of the County of Westchester, were exposed, by the movement of the enemy into the last-named County. All these had been removed from their proper places and lodged, for greater safety, in private houses, in different parts of the County, where, it was feared, they would become exposed to the enemy: and William Miller, of Harrison's Precinct, Theodorus Bartow, of New Rochelle, and John Cozine were appointed Commissioners for collecting them and removing them to Kingston, in Ulster-county, with instructions to gather and remove the scattered papers, "with all possible expedition," and to deliver them, at Kingston, to Dirck Wynkoop, Abraham Hasbrouck, and Christopher Tappen; and the Commissioners were authorized to call for a military guard, "to attend the said records, in their removal."[5]

On the fifteenth of October, the local Committee of Poundridge became so much alarmed, by reason of the movements of the "disaffected," in its vicinity, that the subject was laid before the Convention;[6] and the local Convention, and even individual members of that body, continued to worry General Washington

[1] *General Heath to General Nixon*, "KING'S BRIDGE, October 14, 1776."

[2] Vide pages 221, 222, ante.

[3] *Journal of the Committee of Safety*, "Monday morning, Octor. 14, "1776."

[4] The Morris family had left Morrisania, at the first appearance of danger. (*Lewis Morris to the Convention*, "PHILADELPHIA, Septr. 24, 1776.") John Jay obtained a leave of absence, on the fifteenth of October, to assist in the removal of his aged parents, with their effects, from their home, at Rye, to a place of safety, one of the most honorable acts of his life, (*Journal of the Convention*, "Tuesday afternoon, 15 October, 1776.") The pathetic story of Phebe Oakley, (*Petition*, December 2, 1776,) and other evidences of equal value, clearly indicate that, among those who are less known to fame but equally worthy of respect, the removal of families and their effects, to places of supposed greater safety, at the time of which we write, very generally prevailed.

[5] *Journal of the Convention*, "Tuesday morning, Octor. 15, 1776."

[6] As the note of the Committee indicated the feeling of the more active of the disaffected, at that time—although the great body of those who were discontented made no attempt to take up arms or to join the Royal Army, preferring to remain at home, in peace—we make room for it, in this place;

"POUNDRIDGE, October 15, A.D., 1776.

"HONOURED SIRS:

"We, the Sub-Committee of Poundridge, in West-Chester County, "beg leave to inform your Honours that we are apprehensive that "there is danger of our prisoners leaving us and going to the Min-"isterial Army, as we are not more than nine or ten miles from the "water, where the Sound is full of the Ministerial ships and tenders. "One of our number is already gone to Long-Island, and numbers are "gone from other places, which are, no doubt, now with the Minis-"terial Army. There are disaffected persons daily going over to them, "which gives us much trouble. Therefore, we humbly beg your Hon-"ours would give us some directions concerning them, that they may "be speedily removed at some farther distance. We would also inform "you that for the misdemeanors of one of them and our own safety, we "have been oldiged to commit him to gaol at the White Plains.

"These, with all proper respects, from yours to serve,

"JOSHUA AMBLER, *Chairman of Committee*

"TO THE HONOURABLE CONVENTION OF THE STATE OF NEW-YORK."

with recitals of dangers from the "disaffected" who, singular as it appeared to those local despots, were not inclined to submit, passively, to whatever of insult or of injury those in revolution should be inclined to impose on them—only in very exceptional instances, however, did that "disaffection" extend beyond a disinclination to approve, in formal words, all which the Congresses had done, while the inclination to approve the Colonial policy of Great Britain was no stronger; and the general disinclination to leave their homes and their families and to resort to arms, or to render any assistance whatever, which the "disaffected," everywhere, presented, was as productive of disappointment to the commanders of the Royal Army as it was to General Washington. Neither General Howe nor General Washington understood of what that "disaffection" was generally composed; and partisan writers and partisan orators, from that day to this, have delighted to make that "disaffection" something else than it really was, and to invest the "disaffected," as a class, with characteristics and aims to which, unless in exceptional instances, they were strangers. Had the conservative farmers of Westchester-county—and these were not unlike the great bodies of the farmers, in all the Colonies—been permitted to dissent, quietly, from the policies of both the Home Government and the Continental Congress, and to have approved, quietly, of the spirited opposition to the Colonial policy of the Home Government and of the almost audacious demands for a redress of the grievances of the Colonies, which were made by the General Assembly of the Colony of New York, as they were certainly and generally inclined to do; and had not the aristocratic and haughty leaders of the revolutionary faction, in New York, attempted to secure uniformity of merely political opinions—and those to be only such opinions as they should dictate, by the methods which characterized the bigoted and relentless Clergy, in cases of religious dissent from their Calvinistic Congregationalism, in puritannic Massachusetts and Connecticut—as the those high-toned leaders persistently attempted, it is doubtful if "disaffection" would have been heard of, unless in some individual instances, which would have been harmless because of their insignificance; and it is morally certain that, if the love of home and the sense of wrongs inflicted by the Mother Country and the respect for those bearing authority, which everywhere prevailed, had been permitted to exercise the influences which they would have surely exercised, especially if they had been supported by that forbearance and by that respect for freedom of conscience, in political affairs, and by those appeals for harmony which every Christian man would have employed and none but civilized savages would have declined to employ, New York, if not the entire Continent, would have appeared, in the Autumn of 1776, as she had appeared in the Spring of 1774, before the spirit of factional strife had blighted the hopes of patriots [illegible], as one [illegible], regardless of [illegible] differences and social inequalities, commanding and, if needs be, supporting in arms, the Rights and the honor of the Colony and of the Continent. But that controlling faction had other ends than those of the country's welfare in view; and a narrow, bigoted, haughty, and relentless proscription and persecution of those whose political opinions differed from their own, very reasonably caused "disaffection" among the victims, without, however, leading them, to any considerable extent,[1] to strike, in retaliation—they would have been worthy of all which was heaped on them, had they endured that proscription and that persecution, without becoming "disaffected:" it was honorable that, although "disaffected," they declined to take up arms, even in retaliation or self-defence, when those arms, thus employed, would have been employed against their own country.

There does not appear to have been any movement, which is worthy of especial notice, in either Army, on the fifteenth of October; but in the *General Orders* of that day, Colonel Joseph Reed's Regiment was ordered to join the Brigade commanded by General McDougal; and Colonel Hutchinson's Regiment was ordered to join the Brigade commanded by General Clinton. The Regiments commanded, respectively, by Colonels Sargent, Ward, and Chester and by Lieutenant-colonel Storrs, were formed into a Brigade, to be commanded by Colonel Sargent; and the Regiments commanded, respectively, by Colonels Douglass, Ely, Horseford, and by Majors Rogers and Graves, were, also, formed into a Brigade, to be commanded by General Saltonstall. The several Brigades of the Army were formed into Divisions,[2] those commanded, respectively, by Brigadier-generals Heard, Beall, and Weedon were to form the Division to be commanded by Major-general Putnam; those commanded, respectively, by Brigadier-generals Lord Stirling, Wadsworth, and Fellows were to form the Division to be commanded by Major-general Spencer; those commanded, respectively, by Brigadier-generals Nixon, McDougal, and James Clinton, the last commanded by Colonel Glover, were to form the Division to be commanded by Major-general Lee; those commanded, respectively, by Brigadier-generals Parsons, Scott, and George Clinton were to form the Division to be com-

[1] The reader has been, already, informed of what General Howe stated on the backwardness of the Colonists, even of those who had claimed to have been loyal, *in taking up arms* against their own country, (*vide pages* 212, 225, *ante.*) We need not repeat the statements.

[2] It is a noticeable fact, and one which has seriously perplexed those who have attempted to study the history of that period and, very often, has led them astray, that, until the time now under notice, the Regiments of the Army were not, generally, arranged into Brigades and Divisions; and that neither Brigadier-generals nor Major-generals had any specified Regiments under their especial command—they commanded those who were present and on duty, wherever they might happen to be; and it is hardly to be wondered at, that there was so little of order and discipline in the Army: it is rather remarkable there were as much of them as there appears to have been.

manded by Major-general Heath; those commanded, respectively, by Brigadier-generals Saltonstall, Sargent, and Hand were to form the Division to be commanded by Major-general Sullivan; and the Massachusetts Militia, then serving with the Army, was to be formed into a Division to be commanded by Major-general Lincoln.[1] At the same time, the General, in the most pressing terms, exhorted all Officers commanding Divisions, Brigades, and Regiments, to have their Officers and the men under their respective commands properly informed of what was expected from them, that no confusion might arise in case they should be suddenly called to action, which, there was no kind of doubt, was near at hand; and he hoped and flattered himself that the only contention would be who should render the most acceptable service to his country and his posterity. He also desired that the Officers would be particularly attentive to the mens's Arms and ammunition, that there might be no deficiency or application for Cartridges when they were called into the field.[2]

On Wednesday, the sixteenth of October, General Washington, accompanied by the other Generals, made a careful reconnaissance of the ground at and near Pell's or Rodman's-neck,[3] towards which, it is very evident, his attention had been particularly directed, as the point towards which the next movement of the enemy would probably be directed.[4]

With all the information, concerning "the enemy's "intention to surround" the American Army, which the General had been able to secure; with all the knowledge which his personal and careful reconnaissance of the country had imparted to him; and with all the intelligence concerning "the turbulence of "the disaffected in the upper parts of this State," which the Convention had communicated to him, he re-assembled the Council of War which had met and adjourned on the preceding Sunday,[5] [*October* 13;] and he laid all these matters before it, for its consideration.

That very notable Council was assembled at the Head-quarters of General Lee; and, besides the Commander-in-chief, Major-generals Lee, Putnam, Heath, Spencer, and Sullivan; Brigadier-generals Lord Stirling, Mifflin, McDougal, Parsons, Nixon, Wadsworth, Scott, Fellows, Clinton, and Lincoln; and Colonel Knox, commanding the Artillery, were present—although General Greene was at the Head-quarters of the Army, on Harlem-heights, he was evidently out of humor and was not present.[6] After the Commander-in-chief had communicated to the assembled Generals those letters from the Convention of the State and those "accounts of deserters showing the enemy's "intention to surround" the American Army, to which reference has been made, and after much consideration and debate, the following question was stated: "Whether, (it having appeared that the ob-"structions in the North River have proved insuffi-"cient, and that the enemy's whole force is now in "our rear, on Frog Point,) it is now deemed possible, "in our present situation, to prevent the enemy from "cutting off the communication with the country and "compelling us to fight them, at all disadvantages, "or surrender prisoners at discretion?" With only one dissenting voice, that of General George Clinton, the Council agreed that "it is not possible to prevent "the communication from being cut off; and that "one of the consequences mentioned in the question "must certainly follow." Largely, if not entirely, in deference to the expressed will of the Continental Congress, the Council resolved, however, apparently with entire unanimity, "that Fort Washington be re-"tained as long as possible."[7]

---

[1] Although General Lincoln was considered and named, in the *General Order* now under notice, as a Major-general, it is probable that that was only his rank in the Militia of Massachusetts, since, in the Council of War, which was held on the following day, [*October* 16,] he was ranked as only a Brigadier-general, and then only at the lower end of the line of Brigadiers.

[2] *General Orders*, "HEAD-QUARTERS, HARLEM HEIGHTS, October 15, "1776."

[3] *Memoirs of General Heath*, 71.

[4] The first reconnaissance which the General made, after the enemy's occupation of Throgg's-neck, included "the Necks adjacent," so that he was not ignorant of the character of the ground on and near Pell's-neck; but, on the morning of the sixteenth—probably because of information received, on the preceding day, from some deserters from the fleet, who had been taken to Head-quarters and personally examined by the General, with evident confidence in their testimony, (*General Washington to Governor Trumbull*, "HEAD-QUARTERS, HEIGHTS OF HARLEM, October 16, 1776,")—another and more minute examination of the ground was made, as stated in the text.

[5] Vide page 233, ante.

[6] *General Greene to Governor Cooke*, "HEAD-QUARTERS, NEW-YORK ISLAND, October 16, 1776."

Singular as it would appear to be, were not the propensity for securing all the honor which belongs to them and as much more as is possible, so generally prevalent among those who have occupied public places, Gordon, who was so largely the exponent of General Greene's opinions and pretensions, made the latter take a leading part, in the Council, in opposing the movement of the Army from Harlem Heights; but the official *Minutes of the Council* clearly show that General Greene was not present, and, therefore, could not have taken any part in the proceedings of that body, (*Compare the* Proceedings of a Council of General Officers at the Head quarters of General Lee, October 16, 1776, *with Gordon's* History of the American Revolution ii. 338.)

[7] *Proceedings of a Council of General Officers held at the Head-quarters of General Lee*, October 16, 1776.

Because of evident errors in the copy of that paper which is printed in Force's *American Archives*, V., ii., 1117, 1118, we have preferred the copy of it, evidently taken from the original manuscript, which appears in Sparks's *Writings of George Washington*, Ed. Boston: 1834, iv., 155, note.

In his evidently new-born zeal, adverse to the military and personal character of General Charles Lee, Bancroft has exposed his entire inability to understand and correctly describe a military movement, whatever his capability of understanding and correctly describing a political movement may be, in what he has written concerning "the origin of "the retirement of the American Army from New York." (*History of the United States*, Edit. Boston: 1866, ix., 175, note; *the same*, centenary edition, v., 449, note.)

In his attempt to take from General Lee everthing of credit for having united with others, in advising that "retirement of the Amer-"ican Army from New York," which is now under consideration, that venerable and distinguished historian has entirely disregarded the action of that Council of War, in which the Commander-in-chief was officially informed, the first time, of the opinions of the General Officers, concerning the further occupation of the Heights of Harlem by the main body of the American Army, on which opinions the *General Orders* for

The several positions occupied by the different portions of the Army, from day to day, have not been noticed, with any degree of [illegible] in any of the official documents or publications of that period, as far as we have knowledge; but it is evident that the command of Major-general Spencer was moved from the exterior lines, on the Heights of Harlem, to which it had been ordered on the preceding Monday, [*October* 14,][1] and carried into Westchester-county—the Brigades commanded, respectively, by Brigadier-generals Wadsworth and Fellows were moved to Kingsbridge,[2] probably further northward; and the Brigade commanded by Brigadier-general Lord Stirling, to which the Regiments commanded, respectively, by Colonels Weedon and Reed were added,[3] was pushed forward, first, to the Mile Square and, afterwards, to the White Plains.[4] A portion, if not the whole, of the Brigade commanded by Colonel Glover was evidently moved to support whatever guard there may have been posted on the outlet from Pell's, or Rodman's, neck;[5] two Regiments of the Massachusetts Militia, from the command of Major-general Lincoln, were "sent up the river," [*the Hudson-river,*] "to watch the motions of the ships," [*the* Phœnix, *the* Roebuck, *and the* Tartar, *then lying off Tarrytown.*] "and to oppose any landing of men, that they may attempt;"[6] while the Head-quarters of that small Division and, probably, the two remaining Regiments, were posted on Valentine's-hill,[7] in the Town of Yonkers, one of those ridges which formed, and which still form, a distinguishing feature in the topography of Westchester-county; and, at the time of which we write, the most southerly of those high grounds, extending northerly as far as the White Plains, which were subsequently occupied by detachments of the American Army, while the main body of that Army was laboriously and painfully occupied in its famous retreat, with its baggage and stores, from the Heights of Harlem to the high grounds at the last mentioned-place;[8] and General Heath's Division was posted in a line extending from Fort Independence to Valentine's-hill.[9] It is said, also, that a line of entrenched encampments was also formed, along the high grounds, on the western side of the Bronx-river, from Valentine's-hill, on the South, to Chatterton's-hill, opposite the White Plains, on the North;[10] but by which of the Regiments they were

that "retirement" were largely based, and from the date of which officially expressed opinions, alone, that of "the origin of the retirement of the American Army from New York" can be accurately ascertained.

Surely the historian could not have been sincere when he described the hurried movement of the Regiment commanded by Colonel Smallwood, on the twelfth of October, to oppose the progress of the enemy from Throgg's-neck, as a "retirement of the American Army from New York;" and because the weight of his authorities, in support of his fancy, was confined to a single letter, written by the Adjutant-general of the Army to his wife, on the day after the enemy landed on Throgg's-neck, in which that officer said, "The principal part of this Army is "moved off this island"—a movement from the works on Harlem Heights, which was only for the purpose of holding the enemy in check, and that not, by any means, in fact, approaching a movement of "the "principal part of the Army," nor with either an intimation or a pretense that it was a "retirement of the American Army" from its strong position—without any other testimony whatever to support it, we are constrained to attribute the statement under consideration, either to have been an ebullition of his antipathy against General Lee or one of the reasonable results of his ignorance of what was necessary to constitute a "retirement of the American Army from New York."

It would have been more creditable to the authorial reputation of that venerable writer of history, had he read what General Washington instructed his Secretary to write to the President of the Congress, on the seventeenth of October, the day after the Council had advised him of the inexpediency of holding the Heights of Harlem, with the main body of the Army, on the subject of the "change of our disposition, to counter-"act the operations of the enemy, declining an attack on our front." Had he read that very simple statement, he would have ascertained that the Commander in chief was not aware, on the seventeenth of October, that any portion of the Army, at that time, had been "taken from "hence," in the sense of a "retirement of the Army;" that the "change "of the disposition" of the Army had not, then, been made; that that proposed "change of our disposition" was frankly stated to have been "determined" on, in the Council of General Officers, on the preceding day; and that "General Lee, who arrived on Monday, had strongly "urged the absolute necessity of the measure," not yet executed.

[1] Vide page 234, ante.

[2] *Memoirs of General Heath*, 71.

[3] *General Orders*, "Head-quarters, Harlem Heights, October 17, "1776."

[4] *Memoirs of General Heath*, 74.

[5] The action which occurred on the eighteenth of October, the day after that of which we write, was maintained by the Regiments commanded, respectively, by Colonels Sherpard, Read, Baldwin, and Glover, all of them belonging to the Brigade commanded by Colonel Glover, in the absence of General James Clinton.—(*Vide pages* 211–216, *post.*)

[6] *General Washington to Governor Trumbull*, "Heights of Harlem, "15 October, 1776."

[7] *Memoirs of General Heath*, 73.

[8] Vide pages 239; 250, 251; 254; etc., post.

[9] The two Regiments of Connecticut encamped on the Harlem-river, belonging to General Parson's Brigade, (*General Orders*, "Head-quar-"ters, Harlem Heights, October 15, 1776,") were ordered to pass over the new Bridge and join Colonel Swartwout; and, with his Regiment, to form a flank-guard. Of the Brigade commanded by General Parsons, the Regiments commanded, respectively, by Colonels Prescott and Huntington were ordered to occupy Fort Independence; Colonel Ward, with his Regiment, was ordered to Fletcher's, to the eastward of Fort Independence; the Regiments commanded, respectively, by Colonels Tyler and Wyllys, were ordered to form a Reserve; and Captain Treadwell, with a three pounder, and Lieutenant Berbeck, with a howitzer, were attached to the Brigade. Of the Brigade commanded by General Scott, the Regiments commanded, respectively, by Colonels Lasher and Malcolm were ordered to form a Reserve;* Colonel Drake, with his Regiment, was ordered to occupy the Redoubt, in Batey's cornfield; Colonel Hardenberg, with his Regiment, was ordered to occupy the Redoubt, on Cannon-hill; and Lieutenant Fleming and Fenno, each with a three-pounder, were attached to the Brigade. Of General George Clinton's Brigade, the Regiments commanded, respectively, by Colonels Nicolls and Thomas were ordered to form a Reserve; Colonel Pawling, with his Regiment, was ordered to occupy Valentine's cornfield, with Colonel Graham and his Regiment on his left; and Captain Bryant, with a three-pounder, and Lieutenant Jackson, with a six pounder, were attached to the Brigade. (*Division Orders*, "King's Bridge, October 17, 1776.")

[10] *General Howe to Lord George Germaine*, "New-York, 30 November "1776;" Sauthier's *Plan of the Operations of the King's Army under the Command of General Sir William Howe K. B., in New-York and East New-Jersey; A Plan of the Country from Frog's Point to Croton River shewing the positions, etc.*; *Annual Register for* 1776; *History of Europe*, 177; Gordon's *History of the American Revolution*, ii., 339; Marshall's *Life of George Washington*, ii., 500; etc.

Reference may properly be made, in this place, to the two Maps, named among the authorities referred to, in this instance—one of them drawn

* There are some reasons for supposing that those two Regiments constituted the force left, under Colonel Lasher, for the protection of Fort Independence, when the Division was moved to the White Plains.


Haverstraw Bay
Croton Fer.
Tellers Pt.
TAPPAN SEA
Kapp Cr.
Croton R.
Heights
Kisco R.
North Castle
Kipp
Heights of North Castle
Hate
Lane
Lane
Underhill
Mill R.
Lewis
Purdy
Back
Clapp
King Street
School H.
Tarrytown
Hamman
Taylor
Davis
Albany R.
Road to
WHITE PLAINS
Harrisons
Purchase
Chatterton
Hatfield


A PLAN of the COUNTRY
from FROGS POINT to CROTON RIVER
shewing the Positions of the American
and British Armies from the 12th of
October 1776 until the ENGAGEMENT
on the WHITE PLAINS on the 28th
SCALE
Miles
Haverstraw Bay
Croton Fer
North Castle
Heights of North Castle
Underhill
Tarrytown
TAPPAN SEA
Tappan Cr
Mill R
Kirby Street
Harrisons
Purchase
WHITE PLAINS
Chatterton
Hatfield
Heights of Mt Kisco
Heights of Rochelle
Rochelle
Chester
PELHAM'S MANOR
Mamaroneck
Sutton's Pt
Frogs Pt
Fort Lee
Fort Washington
Sunken Chevaux de Frise
Mill Pt
Mamaroneck R
Blind Br
Heady
Sawdale
Smith
Ward
Hunt
Purdy
Young
Taylor
Davis
Hammon
Lewis
Clapp
Burk
Schooll
Lane
Hale
Kemp
Tellers Pt
Croton R
Kisco R
Heights
Tappan Cr
Scarsdale
Bronxville
Eastchester
Pelham
Throgs Neck
Mill Neck
Bronx R
Hutchinson's R
Heights of Fordham
Heights of Rochelle
Heights of Mt Kisco
Heights of White Plains
Ford of the British Army to the White Plains
Road to Albany
Road to Mt Kisco
Road to Rochelle
Road to Throgs Neck
Road to Fordham
Road to Eastchester
Road to Pelham
Road to Chester
Road to Mamaroneck
Road to Sawdale
Road to Tarrytown
Road to Kisco
Road to Bronxville
Road to Mill Neck
Road to Mill Pt
Road to Frogs Pt
Road to Fort Washington
Road to Fort Lee
Road to Sunken Chevaux de Frise
Road to Throgs Neck
Road to Rochelle

constructed and by whom occupied, we are unable to state with certainty, although we suspect that the Massachusetts Militia, commanded by General Lincoln, and the two Brigades of General Spencer's Division, commanded, respectively, by Generals Fellows and Wadsworth, who had been moved from the Heights of Harlem to Kingsbridge, on the seventeenth of October, were the artificers who constructed and the soldiers who occupied that very greatly important line of hastily constructed earthworks.

There had not been much haste displayed in the American Army, in changing its position on the Heights of Harlem, made really strong by the outlay of immense labor, notwithstanding the enemy had completely turned its left flank, occupied a position on its rear, and with the veriest mite of an effort was capable of throwing a strong force across its entire rear, of seizing every line of communication and every strong position, and of forming such a line of offensive operations, covered, on either flank, by the ships off Tarrytown and the fleet off Throgg's-neck, which the Americans, in their generally unknown weakness and poverty of supplies, could scarcely have hoped to overcome. But General Washington had a lingering suspicion that the movement of the enemy to Throgg's-neck was only a feint; that he remained in that unseemly position only to await the proper time when he could quickly embark again, and drop down to Morrisania, on one tide; and that caution was necessary.[1] Besides that caution, in the Commander-in-chief, there was a great scarcity of the means for transporting the Stores and Baggage to another and distant position;[2] and, with commenda-

by Claude Joseph Sauthier, a celebrated Engineer in the service of the King, and published by William Faden, in London, in 1777; the other, drawn by the Engineers of the American Army for, and preserved by, General Washington, and engraved, from the original manuscript, for the illustration of the original edition of Chief-justice Marshall's *Life of George Washington*, published in Philadelphia, in 1804.

As both of these Maps were originally official, one British and the other American; as both were published from the respective manuscripts, as nearly as possible in *fac-simile*; and as both are historical authorities of the highest character, they will be frequently referred to, in our narrative of the Military Operations in Westchester-county; and, in order that our readers may also enjoy the benefits to be derived from a use of them, while reading the story of Westchester-county's revolutionary history, the Publishers have re-produced them, at our request, as nearly in exact *fac-simile* of the original publications, as possible. Sauthier's Map will be found opposite page 227 of this work, *ante*; and General Washington's Map will be found opposite this page of the same.

We may be permitted, however, to call the reader's attention to a singular error which was made in *lettering* the British Map. Where "Philipsburgh," [*Philipsborough*,] or Yonkers, should have been designated the word "Wepperham"—intended for "Neperhan," the name of the stream, popularly known as the "Sawmill-river," at the mouth of which Philipsborough, or Yonkers, stood—has been erroneously inserted; and, instead of designating Tarrytown, not "Terrytown," as situated miles *above* the Pocantico, on which the *upper* Manorhouse of the Manor of Philipsborough yet stands, that noted village ought to have been designated *below* that stream—indeed, the Pocantico is made to appear as if it were the Neperhan, or Sawmill-river; and Dobbs's-ferry and Tarrytown are consequently crowded up, into the immediate vicinity of the Croton-river, although they are several miles below that stream; and all the other lettering of the Map is similarly forced to the northward, unduly, in order that it may be made to correspond with the river-villages.

Probably misled by the errors referred to, in the official Map, the beautiful Map of the same Military Operations, which illustrates Stedman's *History of the American War*, has repeated the mistakes, in all their ugliness; and the first edition of Lossing's *Field-book of the Revolution* perpetuated the unwelcome errors.

[1] *Colonel Harrison to General Heath*, "HEAD-QUARTERS, October 12, "1776;" *Colonel Grayson to the same*, "HEAD-QUARTERS, October 13, "1776;" *the same to Governor Trumbull*, "HEAD-QUARTERS, HARLEM "HEIGHTS, October 15, 1776;" etc.

On the morning of the eighteenth of October, while the enemy was seen in motion to the *eastward* of Throgg's neck, when that fact was communicated to General Washington, by General Heath, the latter was ordered to return to his command, which had been posted with its right at Valentine's and its left at Fort Independence, and to have it "formed, "ready for action, immediately, and to take such a position as might ap-"pear best calculated to oppose the enemy, should they attempt to land "another body of troops on Morrisania, which he thought not improba-"ble;" and General Heath "immediately obeyed the Order." (*Memoirs of General Heath*, 72.)

[2] That scarcity will be evident to the reader of *General Orders* of the seventeenth of October, in which "some Regiments" are ordered "to "move towards them," [*the enemy*,] in which Orders were also included for the government of those Regiments, in the transportation of their Tents and Baggage.

See, also, *Quartermaster-general Mifflin to William Duer*, "MOUNT WASH-"INGTON, October 20, 1776."

Gordon, when describing the movement from Harlem Heights, said, "The movement was attended with much difficulty, for want of Wag-"gons and Artillery horses. When a part was forwarded, the other was "fetched on. This was the general way of removing the Camp-equip-"page and other appendages of the Army. The few Teams which were "at hand, were in no wise equal to the service; and their deficiency "could be made up only by the bodily labor of the men." (*History of the American Revolution*, ii., 339, 340.)

It would be useful, were some one to ascertain and to inform the world of historical literature, just why there was such a remarkable scarcity of Teams, in such an old-settled agricultural community as occupied the lower Towns of Westchester-county, in the Autumn of 1776, especially of those Teams which were required by the American Army, by whom that portion of the County had been occupied, during several weeks preceding the date of the retreat from Harlem Heights. There would be some curious revelations of the inefficiency of the Quarter-master-general's Department; but there would, also, be some very much more curious revelations of thefts of horses, by the Officers of the Army, not for their present purposes, but for their use, in the future, after their retirement from the service. Vide *General Orders*, October 31, 1776.

The farmers of Westchester-county were robbed, indiscriminately, not only by the camp-followers and the privates of the Army, but by the Officers, including Field-officers;* and, in that work of plunder, the records are singularly ample in their evidence that the plunderers were almost exclusively men and Officers of the Massachusetts and Connecticut Lines.† At a later period than that which is now under consideration, even a Major-general of the Continental Army was confederated with similar thieves; and gave orders on the Paymasters of the Army for

* *The Committee of Safety to the President of the Continental Congress*, "IN COMMITTEE OF SAFETY FOR THE STATE OF NEW YORK, FISHKILL, "November 28, 1776;" *Deposition of John Marlane*, "13 November, 1776;" *Deposition of Marmaduke Foster*, "13 November, 1776;" *Petition of Phebe Oakley*, "2 December, 1776;" *Deposition of Tolman Pupsley*, "2 Decem-"ber, 1776;" *Deposition of Ebenezer Burrill*, "2 December, 1776;" *Journal of the Committee of Safety*, "Monday morning, 2 December, 1776;" *the Committee of Safety to General Heath*, "IN COMMITTEE OF SAFETY FOR "THE STATE OF NEW YORK, FISHKILL, December 3, 1776;" *Petition of Inhabitants of Westchester-county*, "WESTCHESTER-COUNTY, December 23, "1776;" etc.

† The Regiment of Massachusetts Artificers, commanded by Colonel Brewer, and the Regiment of Connecticut troops, commanded by Colonel Charles Webb, were especially notorious, as thieves.

See, *General Order for securing Sergeant Tripp and others*, "PEEKSKILL, "11 December, 1776;" *Minutes of Court Martial for trial of Major Austin*, "PHILIPSBURG, November 12, 1776;" *Commitment of Captain Phineas Ford to the Dutchess-county Jail*, "BY THE COMMITTEE OF SAFETY OF THE "STATE OF NEW-YORK, FISHKILL, January the 1st, 1776;" etc.

ble prudence, a removal of Head-quarters from the strong position which they, then, occupied, was not attempted until every possible preparation for a successful removal of them had been duly made. Every portion of the Army was so disposed, however, that all could be concentrated around Head-quarters, in a short time, should such a movement become necessary, although the enemy was, also, properly and effectively guarded; and, although there was no appearance of haste, in anything which was done, there was, also, abundant evidence that the Commander-in-chief, no longer given away to despondency, was entirely mindful of the great responsibility which, then, rested on him.

While all these anxieties had prevailed throughout the American Army, and while all these precautions were being taken by General Washington, General Howe and the main body of the Royal Army had been quietly encamped on Throgg's-neck. With the exception of a scattering fire across the marsh which separated the Neck from the mainland, which seems to have done no material damage,[1] there does not appear to have been any offensive movement whatever;[2] and there is very little reason for supposing that the entire period of the stay of the Army, at that place, was not duly occupied in the transportation of Stores and Provisions and means for Transportation and what must have been regarded as necessary reinforcements.[3]

It is not an uncommon occurrence for those who are without information, during a War, to condemn what they regard as the tardiness, sometimes as the criminal tardiness, of a commanding General, in the movement of his command on some enterprise on which the faultfinders have rested large, very often unduly large, expectations; and General Howe has not escaped from that very common condemnation. As we have already stated,[4] he has been condemned for having blundered, because he occupied Throgg's-neck instead of some more favorable point, on the mainland; but, as we have also shown, whatever of censure there may have been due for having thus blundered in occupying that isolated Neck, if there was any blunder in the case, it belonged to Admiral Lord Howe instead of to the General, his brother. General Howe has been condemned, also, because of his long stay on Throgg's-neck, without having attempted to move from that position, in any direction whatever,[5] but surely no one would have desired him to move into an enemy's country, in the face of an active military force of that enemy, without a Commissariat, without the necessary military Stores which would become necessary in his conduct of the proposed movement into that enemy's country, and without the slightest pretense to the necessary means for transporting even his Officers' baggage, of all of which the first and second detachments had taken comparatively little to the Neck, and of all of which the subsequent and main supplies were held back by adverse winds, which prevented the vessels which bore them from passing through Hell-gate.[6] In addition to the delays in moving the Commissariat, the military Stores, and the Horses and Waggons of the Quarter-master-general's Department,[7] to which reference has been made, some delay was also experienced in moving three Battalions of Hessians, from Staten-island, for the reinforcement of the main body, on the Neck;[8] and thus, in General Howe's own words, "Four or five days had been "unavoidably taken up in landing at Frog's-Neck, "instead of going, at once, to Pell's-point, which "would have been an imprudent measure, as it could

payment of the transportation of the plunder, from the scenes of the thefts to the homes of the thieves and of their accessories, of high or low degree, in the neighboring State of Connecticut.*

[1] *Memoirs of General Heath*, 70, 71.

[2] Judge Jones, in his remarkably accurate *History of New York during the Revolutionary War*, (i., 122,) said of General Howe's occupation of Throgg's neck, "here a whole fortnight was spent in doing nothing "(plundering the inhabitants and stealing their horses excepted)." We incline to the belief, however, that General Howe had no communication with the mainland sufficient to enable him to seize horses; and there could not have been much opportunity for plunder, by the troops, unless on the Neck, for the same controlling reason.

The Judge was also evidently in error as to the period of General Howe's occupation of the Neck,—he landed, there, on the twelfth of October, and he moved from it, on the eighteenth of the same month, which can hardly be said, with propriety, to have been "a whole fortnight."

[3] *General Howe to Lord George Germaine*, "NEW-YORK, 30 November, "1776."

* *General George Clinton to Lieutenant-colonel Hamilton*, "POUGHKEEP-"SIE, 28 December, 1777."

It is a singular fact that the Major-general referred to in the Note, also inspired the destruction of the White Plains, in which Major Austin also first plundered those whose houses he destroyed. (*Testimony of Sergeant Churchill and Tilley Hoit, on the trial of Major Austin*, as to the robbery, and *Major Austin's Defence before the same Court*, as to the original author of the devastation.)

[4] Vide page 231, ante.

[5] [Hall's] *History of the Civil War in America*, i., 203; Stedman's *History of the American War*, i., 210, 211; Gordon's *History of the American Revolution*, ii., 337; Adolphus's *History of England*, Ed. London: 1805, ii., 379; Sparks's *Life of George Washington*, 194; Irving's *Life of George Washington*, ii., 385; etc.

[6] *General Howe to Lord George Germaine*, "NEW-YORK, 30 November, "1776;" *General Howe's Speech before a Committee of the House of Commons*, April 29, 1779; *Annual Register for 1776*; *History of Europe*, 176*; etc.

The adverse winds, which prevented the supplies, etc., from passing Hell-gate, were referred to by *General Howe in his letter to Lord George Germaine*, "NEW-YORK, 30 November, 1776;" and *in those of Lieutenant-colonel Tench Tilghman to William Duer*, "HEAD-QUARTERS, HARLEM HEIGHTS, "October 17, 1776;" *General Washington to the Continental Congress*, "HARLEM HEIGHTS, October 18, 1776;" etc.

[7] "He transported Carriages with him from England; and whatever "more he wanted were procured on Long Island and Staten Island," (Galloway's *Reply to the* Observations of Lieutenant-general Sir William Howe, 9.)

[8] In his despatch to Lord George Germaine, "NEW-YORK, 30 Novem-"ber, 1776," General Howe stated that "three Battalions of Hessians "were drawn from Staten Island;" but in his *Speech before a Committee of the House of Commons*, April 29, 1779, when his conduct, as Commander-in-chief of the King's forces in North America, was under consideration, he stated, without contradiction, that the reinforcement consisted of "the Second Division of Hessians." We have preferred the former statement; because there was, then, only one Brigade of Hessians on Staten Island; and because the "Second Division of Hessians," under General Knyphausen, had not, then, reached America.

"not have been executed without much unnecessary "risk."[1]

Having at length, completely effected his occupation of Throgg's-neck and completely provided for his probable needs, General Howe determined to open his operations in Westchester-county, without further delay; and, at one o'clock in the morning of Friday, the eighteenth of October, the van of the Royal Army, consisting of the Light Infantry and Grenadiers of the British Regiments and a portion, at least, if not all, of the German Chasseurs, was re-embarked, in flat boats, on the western side of the Neck; and, having passed around the Point of Throgg's-neck, was landed on Pell's, or, as it was sometimes called, Rodman's, neck, on the opposite side of Hutchinson's-river, in the Town of Eastchester.[2] The main body of the Army crossed over to the eastern side of the Neck; and, during the day, that, also, with all its various appointments and stores and supplies, was carried over to Pell's-neck.[3]

It does not appear that the movement of the van of the Royal Army was seen by the Americans, through the darkness of the very early morning, notwithstanding one of the best of the Brigades in the American service, that of General James Clinton, then commanded by Colonel Glover of Marblehead, had been posted, as a guard, in front of Pell's-neck, the place of its debarkation; and not until daylight had revealed the similar movement of the main body of the Army, was there any suspicion, among the Americans, anywhere, that such a movement was imminent—indeed, the van had landed and moved up toward the main-land, a full mile and a half, before either of the movements was discovered.[4]

The movement of the main body, in upwards of two hundred boats, formed into four grand divisions and covered by the smaller armed vessels of the Fleet, was discovered, "early in the morning," by Colonel Glover himself; by whom, after he had sent Major Lee, the Brigade-Major, as an express to General Lee, whose Quarters were three miles away from that place, the entire Brigade which he commanded, was called to arms, and moved down the Neck, to oppose the landing of the enemy and to hold him in check, until reinforcements should be sent or other Orders be received.

Although the full strength of the Regiments commanded, respectively, by Colonels Shepard, Read, Baldwin, and Glover—the latter, at that time, commanded by Captain Curtis—was less than eight hundred effective men,[5] the brave fisherman who temporarily commanded the Brigade pushed forward toward the place where the enemy's Light Infantry and Grenadiers and Chasseurs had landed, and where the main body was about to land, although the rough and broken ground over which the Brigade was moved compelled him to leave, on his route, the three field-pieces which he had taken from his encampment. He had not marched more than half the dis-

[1] *General Howe's Speech before a Committee of the House of Commons*, April 29, 1776.

[2] *Admiral Lord Howe to Mr. Stephens, Secretary of the Admiralty*, "EAGLE, "OFF NEW-YORK, November 23, 1776;" *General Howe to Lord George Germaine* "NEW-YORK, November 30, 1776;" Lushington's *Life of Lord Harris*, 81; Gordon's *History of the American Revolution*, ii., 338.

[3] *Admiral Lord Howe to Mr. Stephens, Secretary of the Admiralty*, "EAGLE, "OFF NEW-YORK, November 23, 1776;" *General Howe to Lord George Germaine*, "NEW-YORK, November 30, 1776;" David How's *Diary*, October 18, 1776: [Hall's] *History of the Civil War in America*, i., 205; *Memoirs of General Heath*, 72; Gordon's *History of the American Revolution*, ii., 338; Stedman's *History of the American War*, i., 211; etc.

[4] *Extract of a letter from Mile Square*, [evidently written by General Glover,] *dated October 22, 1776*, in *The Freeman's Journal and New Hampshire Gazette*, Vol. I. No. 27, PORTSMOUTH, Tuesday, November 26, 1776.

[5] The following, from the *General Returns of the Army*, will serve to show the strength of that little detachment, both before and after the spirited little affair which is now under notice:

Regiments.	September 21, 1776.								
	Com. Officers.	Staff.	Non-com.	Fit for Duty.	Sick, present.	Sick, absent.	On Command.	Furloughed.	Total, rank and file.
Colonel Shepard's*	19	3	46	268	99	6	200	1	514
Colonel Read's	20	3	31	212	153	8	128	0	501
Colonel Baldwin's	25	5	38	225	147	19	77	0	468
Colonel Glover's	30	3	33	170	43	8	158	0	361
	94	14	148	815	442	41	543	1	1844

Regiments.	October 5, 1776.								
	Com. Officers.	Staff.	Non-com.	Fit for Duty.	Sick, present.	Sick absent.	On Command.	Furloughed.	Total, rank and file.
Colonel Shepard's*	19	5	46	204	102	6	200	1	513
Colonel Read's	22	4	46	226	156	8	129	0	496
Colonel Baldwin's	28	5	37	234	122	34	74	0	464
Colonel Glovers	26	3	35	179	30	8	141	0	360
	95	17	164	843	390	56	541	1	1833

Regiments.	November 2, 1776.								
	Com. Officers.	Staff.	Non-com.	Fit for Duty.	Sick, present.	Sick, absent.	On Command.	Furloughed.	Total, rank and file.
Colonel Shepard's*	20	4	26	227	86	3	186	1	503
Colonel Read's	17	2	34	232	123	7	125	0	487
Colonel Baldwin's	21	4	36	263	106	11	82	0	462
Colonel Glover's	26	3	35	171	20	13	140	0	356
	87	13	131	893	335	34	542	1	1808

* This Regiment was formerly commanded by Colonel Learned, under whom William Shepard was Lieutenant-colonel; but, at the particular request of General Washington, (*Letter dated* "HEAD-QUARTERS, HEIGHTS "OF HARLEM, September 30, 1776,") the latter was promoted to the Colonelcy and the command of the Regiment, by a vote of the Continental Congress, on the second of October, 1776. (*Journal of the Continental Congress*, "Wednesday, October 2, 1776.")

As the Regiment really commanded by Colonel Shepard was often alluded to as "late Learned's," this explanation becomes necessary, in order to enable the reader to understand the subject, correctly.

tance, however, before his further progress was arrested by the unexpected appearance, on his front, of the advance-guard of the enemy's van, the main body of whom, as we have already stated, had been pushed forward, at an early hour, to occupy the landing-place and, if necessary, to cover the descent of the main body; and who, in the absence of any opposing force of the Americans, had evidently sent out a strong detachment of its force, to see what was to be seen and to take advantage of any favorable circumstances which should be presented, in a movement over the Neck, toward the main-land.

With admirable skill and with a deliberate coolness which would have done honor to a soldier of larger pretensions, Colonel Glover threw forward a Captain, with forty men, to feel of that advanced party of the enemy and, if possible, to mask the attempt to dispose of the main-body of his Brigade, in ambuscade, for the further obstruction of the enemy's advance towards the main-land, which was, also, a part of the Colonel's improvised plan of operations. The plan which was thus admirably devised, on the spur of the moment, by Colonel Glover, was quite as admirably and quite as successfully executed by the soldiers of his command—Colonel Read and his Regiment were concealed behind a stone wall, on the left side of the road; Colonel Shepard's Regiment was concealed behind "a fine double stone wall," on the opposite side of the road, and in the rear of Colonel Read's command; Colonel Baldwin and his Regiment were similarly posted, on the right and in the rear of Colonel Shepard's command; and Captain Curtis, with Colonel Glover's own Regiment, was similarly posted where the field-pieces had been left, some distance in the rear; the Captain and his command who had been thrown out, in front, having, meanwhile, evidently held the enemy's advance in check and successfully masked the very important movements of the Brigade, on their rear.

When the disposition of the Brigade had been thus successfully and satisfactorily effected, Colonel Glover rode forward to the Company whom he had employed as a mask, and personally assumed the command of it—the name of the Captain who had so boldly confronted the enemy and held him in check, before the Colonel had completed the disposition of the main body of the Brigade, behind the very convenient stone walls, on his rear, has not been recorded—ordering it to advance toward the enemy; which was promptly done. When it had marched to "within fifty yards" of the place where the enemy had halted, the latter opened his fire, without, however, inflicting any loss on his assailants; and the latter returned the fire, killing or seriously wounding four of the enemy —"we returned the fire and fell four of them," are the quaint words of Colonel Glover, in his description of the opening of this spirited affair. Five rounds were exchanged by the Americans; and they had sustained a loss of two men killed and several wounded, when the enemy, who had, meanwhile, been largely reinforced, pressed forward, in a charge on the gallant little party. As it would have been useless, under the existing circumstances, to have made any further resistance, Colonel Glover ordered the Captain commanding to fall back, which was done with order and coolness—"I ordered a retreat, "which was masterly well done by the Captain that "commanded the party," are the Colonel's words, descriptive of the retrograde movement—the enemy cheering and pushing forward, in pursuit.

Without supposing, for a moment, that the glory of a complete victory had not been already gained, the Chasseurs and Light Infantry and Grenadiers pressed forward, in column, along the narrow country road, until they approached, "within thirty yards," the heavy stone wall, on their right flank, behind which the Regiment commanded by Colonel Read, was concealed; when the latter rose and, from behind its substantial breastwork, poured into them a full and destructive fire. Without attempting to even return the fire, the advancing column broke and fell back and awaited the support of the main body, some portion of whom had evidently effected a landing; while Colonel Glover and his concealed command patiently and hopefully awaited a renewal of the movement.

An hour and a half are said to have passed, before the enemy again advanced, when, with what were supposed to have been four thousand men, strengthened with seven pieces of artillery, he again appeared, keeping up, as he advanced, a constant and noisy but entirely harmless fire, and approached the heavy stone wall, on his right flank, behind which Colonel Read and his men, made more confident by the result of their earlier success, were securely crouched, in complete readiness to receive him. The advancing column seems to have learned nothing from the lesson which the Americans had taught the advance, earlier in the morning; and, with an appearance of bravado, it moved forward, in the midst of the smoke of its own uselessly expended gunpowder, as if there were not an enemy within a day's march of it, until it had approached within fifty yards of the first line of the ambuscade, when Colonel Read and his command arose, as they had arisen when the advance had approached, earlier in the day, and threw on it a deliberate and destructive fire. The suddenness of the attack and the evident strength of its sheltered assailants brought the advancing column to a sudden halt; and it is said that the Americans maintained their ground until they had thrown seven well-directed volleys into the closed ranks of the enemy, by whom, meanwhile, the fire was returned "with "showers of musquetry and cannon-balls," as Colonel Glover has stated, concerning it.

Having thus bravely maintained his ground, until a retreat had become necessary, Colonel Read fell back, without returning to the roadway, until he had

passed the left flank of the Regiment commanded by Colonel Shepard, who had remained, in concealment, on the opposite side of the road, during the entire morning; and there, covering Colonel Shepard's left flank, the Regiment was re-formed, and rested on its arms.

The enemy evidently misunderstood the character of the retreat of Colonel Read and his brave command—like the Officer commanding the detachment, in the morning, he appears to have supposed that he had repulsed the Americans; and that nothing remained to be done, except to gather the fruits of his success—and he cheered and pushed forward, along the narrow roadway, until the head of his column had advanced within easy gun-shot distance from the second line of the ambuscade, on his left flank, where Colonel Shepard and his command were concealed, as we have said, behind "a fine double stone wall;" when the latter sprang to their feet, and, from behind their all-sufficient shelter, poured into him a well-directed and effective fire. The column was again brought to a sudden and unexpected halt; and a long-continued and well-sustained fire was kept up, by each of the belligerent parties—it is said that seventeen volleys were fired by the Americans; and that the enemy's line was broken, "several times, once, in "particular, so far that a soldier of Colonel Shep-"ard's" [*Regiment*] "leaped over a wall, and took a "hat and canteen off of a Captain that lay dead on "the ground they retreated from."

But the disparity of numbers between the opposing forces was so very great that prudence dictated a retreat of the two Regiments who had so successfully held the enemy in check; and Colonel Glover ordered them to fall back and re-form and rest on their arms, in the rear of the third line of the ambuscade, behind which the Regiment commanded by Colonel Baldwin was concealed.

The advancing column of the enemy was again put in motion; but the record of the events of the day make no mention of any mere waste of ammunition nor of any shouts of exultant success; and it is evident that it moved forward, soberly and cautiously, as was becoming, in view of the heavy losses which it had already sustained and of those to which it was predestined. It had not proceeded far before Colonel Baldwin and his command arose from their concealment, behind the third line of the ambuscade; and, suddenly and unexpectedly, they delivered a destructive fire, into the head of the column. It is said, however, that, in this instance, the ground was much in favor of the enemy, enabling him to bring his artillery to bear on the Americans; and that the opposition of the latter was, in consequence of those disadvantages, neither as spirited nor as effective as that which had been made by Colonels Read and Shepard. The Americans were compelled to retreat "to the bottom of "the hill," or high ground on which the ambuscade was formed; through a brook, the bridge over which had been previously taken up, by Colonel Glover; and up the slope, on the opposite side of the road, to the place, on the high ground, where Captain Curtis and Colonel Glover's Regiment and the three field-pieces were posted.

It appears that the enemy did not pursue the retreating Americans, but contented himself, until late in the day, with a continued fire of his artillery, over the little valley and the brook, the Americans, of course, returning it—the latter, without sustaining any loss whatever from the enemy's fire; while the former evidently sustained very little, if any, from the Americans' fire on him.

The Americans having been in front of the enemy, from an early hour, in the morning, all the day, without food or drink, "at dark," they fell back, three miles, and bivouaced—"after fighting all day, with-"out victuals or drink, lay as a picquet, all night, the "heavens over us, and the earth under us, which was "all we had, having left all our baggage at the old "encampment we left in the morning," are Colonel Glover's words, concerning that portion of his Brigade's movements—and, on the morning of Saturday, the nineteenth of October, they marched to the Mile Square, on the western side of the Bronx, in the Town of Yonkers.[1]

The strength of the Brigade commanded by Colonel Glover has been already stated, in detail, from official sources;[2] and, because Colonel Glover would not have left the encampment and all the baggage and stores of the Brigade without a sufficient guard, there is an evident truthfulness in his statement that he carried from his encampment only "about seven "hundred and fifty men and three field-pieces." But, in the same connection, it must be remembered that the two Regiments commanded, respectively, by Colonel's Read and Shepard, sustained almost the entire attacks of the enemy—Colonel Baldwin fell back, without having sustained any other than an artillery-fire; and Captain Curtis only saw the enemy, in the distance, on the other side of the valley—and that, therefore, the number of Americans who were actually engaged did not, probably, exceed four hundred rank and file. The strength of the enemy who was actually engaged has not been stated by any of the foreign authorities; and we can do no more than state the facts which are well-authenticated, and to draw our conclusions from them. It is known that the detachment of the Royal Army which was first moved to Pell's-neck was composed of the Light

[1] We have depended, in this statement of the spirited action at Pelham, on Colonel Glover's homely description of it, contained in a letter, dated at "MILE-SQUARE, October 22, 1776," which was evidently written for the eye of a friend, although it very soon found its way into the newspapers, from one of which—*The Freeman's Journal and New Hampshire Gazette*, Vol. I., No. 27., PORTSMOUTH, Tuesday, November 26, 1776—we made our copy. Force copied it, with some unimportant variations in his *American Archives*, V., ii., 1188, 1189; but we have preferred to use the contemporary edition.

[2] Vide page 241, ante.

Infantry and Grenadiers of the Army;[1] and if the Chasseurs of the German auxiliaries were also included, as more than one of the authorities have stated,[2] and as was more than probable, the previously large force of the detachment was very largely increased. The advance-guard from that detachment was said to have been only thirty men;[3] and these were met and held in check by a Captain and forty men. These, naturally enough, fell back on the main body, not on that of the Army itself, but on that of the detachment which had been moved from Throgg's-neck, in advance of the main body of the Army; and, since that detachment had been thus sent forward, in advance, for the express purpose of holding back any force of the Americans who should incline to obstruct the landing of the main Army, there can be no reasonable doubt that almost the entire force of the detachment was moved forward, against Colonel Glover and his command. In the absence of official Returns, the number of men actually included in that detachment can be only surmised; but the Light Infantry and Grenadiers of the entire British Army, added to the Chasseurs and other Light Infantry and the Grenadiers of the German mercenaries—the Chasseurs taking with them their light regimental fieldpieces—could have been scarcely less than four thousand men, the number stated by Colonel Glover.

The losses sustained by the Americans, in this action, were six men killed,[4] and Colonel Shepard and twelve men wounded;[5] those of the British were three men, killed, and Lieutenant-colonel Musgrave, commanding the First Battalion of Light Infantry, and Captain Evelyn, of the Fourth Regiment of Foot, and twenty men, wounded;[6] those of the Chasseurs, of whom, in such mixed detachments as that under notice, the severest losses usually fell, have not been stated; but they were said to have been, and they probably were, very severe.[7]

It does not appear to have been pretended that General Lee gave any Order or any support to Colonel Glover, notwithstanding the latter despatched his Major of Brigade to the General, with information of the approach of the enemy to Pell's-neck, before he ordered his command to move down the Neck, to oppose the enemy's progress;[8] and, in truth, nothing whatever has been recorded of the doings of General Lee, on that eventful eighteenth of October. It is said, on the other hand, that, early in the morning of that day, the Officer commanding the Regiment which guarded the pass to Throgg's-neck, by way of the causeway and bridge, from the Village of Westchester, suspected the enemy was preparing to move from the Neck, and sent an express to General Heath, with the information; that the latter ordered one of his Aide's to gallop to Valentine's, near whose house General George Clinton and his Brigade were posted, with Orders that the Brigade should be formed, "instantly;" that General Heath reached Valentine's "by the time the Brigade was formed," and ordered the Officer in command "to march with the utmost expedition, to the head of the causeway, to reinforce "the troops, there, himself moving on with them;" that, while on the march, another express met General Heath, informing him that the entire force of the enemy was in motion, and seemed to be moving towards the ford, at the head of the creek which separated Throgg's-neck from the mainland; that the

[1] Lushington's *Life of Lord Harris*, 81.

See, also, *Extract from a letter from Fort Lee*, dated October 20, 1776, in *The Pennsylvania Journal*, No. 1768, PHILADELPHIA, Wednesday, October 23, 1776; Sauthier's *Plan of the Operations*; etc.

[2] *Extract from a letter from Mount Washington*, dated October 23, 1776, in *The Pennsylvania Journal*, No. 1769, PHILADELPHIA Wednesday, October 30, 1776; *General Howe to Lord George Germaine*, "NEW-YORK, 30 "November, 1776;" Sauthier's *Plan*; etc.

[3] *Colonel Glover's letter, dated*, "MILE-SQUARE, October 22, 1776."

[4] We are not insensible that Colonel Glover, in his letter of which so much use has been made, in the preparation of this narrative, stated that *eight* were killed; but the official Returns, referred to, below, clearly indicated that only *six* were killed—no Returns of the Wounded having been made, only the Killed can be noticed.

The Return of the Regiment commanded by Colonel Read shows that, of that Regiment, Samuel Cole, of Captain Pond's Company, Daniel Debond, of Captain Warren's Company, and Ezekiel Fuller, of Captain Peters's Company, were killed. (*A Return of the Killed, Missing*, etc., without date, in Force's *American Archives*, V., ii., 718.)

The Return of Colonel Shepard's Regiment shows that, of that Regiment, Sergeants James Scott and Charles Adams and Private Thaddeus Kemp, all of them of Captain Bolster's Company, were killed. (*A Return of the Killed, Taken, and Missing of the Third Regiment, commanded by Colonel Shepard*, etc., "NORTH-CASTLE, November 19, 1776.")

The Return of Colonel Baldwin's Regiment shows that that Regiment sustained no loss, on the day under consideration. (*Return of the Killed, Wounded, Prisoners, and Missing in the Brigade commanded by Gordon Saltonstall, Esq.*, "NORTH-CASTLE, November 19, 1776.")

The Return of Colonel Glover's Regiment shows that that Regiment, commanded by Captain Curtis, on the occasion now under consideration, sustained no loss—it was not under the enemy's fire. (*A Return of the Officers and Privates Killed, Missing, and Taken, in the Fourteenth Regiment*, etc., "CAMP, NORTH CASTLE, November 19, 1776.")

[5] *Colonel Glover's letter*, "MILE SQUARE, October 22, 1776."

[6] *General Howe to Lord George Germaine*, "NEW-YORK, 30 November, "1776."

[7] It was not the practise, when this skirmish occurred, to notice, in detail, the operations of the German mercenary troops, in the despatches of the Royal Commander-in-chief to the Home Government; and the losses sustained by those troops, in whatever actions they were engaged, were seldom, if ever, included in the detailed Reports of Casualties which were sent to and published by the Government, at London. The Reports of the operations and the casualties of those troops were made to the several sovereign Princes, Electors, etc., of whom those troops were, respectively, subjects; and, except in some few instances, when individual enterprise has unearthed some of them, the text of those Reports and much of the official correspondence remain in their original repositories, unopened and seemingly, uncared for.

The reports of deserters and other unofficial reports made the total loss, including both British and German, from eight hundred to a thousand men, and it is difficult to make one believe that four hundred Americans, familiar from their childhood with the use of firearms, sheltered by ample defences from which they could fire deliberately and with their pieces rested on the tops of their defences, could have possibly fired volley after volley, into a large body of men, massed in a closely compacted column and cooped up in a narrow country roadway, without having inflicted as extended a damage on those who received their fire, as deserter after deserter, to the number of more than half a dozen, on different days, without any connection with each other, severally and separately declared had been inflicted on the enemy's advance, on the occasion now under consideration.

[8] *Colonel Glover's letter dated*, "MILE SQUARE, October 22, 1776."

Brigade was immediately halted, the men were ordered to prime and load their pieces, and the rear Regiment was ordered "to file off by the left and to "march, briskly, to reinforce the Americans, at the "pass, at the head of the creek;" that, while the Brigade was thus halted, General Washington rode up, inquired and was informed of "the state of things;" ordered General Heath to return, immediately, evidently with all the troops who were with him, and to have the entire Division which he commanded formed, ready for action, and to take such a position as should appear to be best adapted for holding the enemy in check, if he should attempt to effect a landing at Morrisania, which the Commander-in-chief "thought not improbable;" and that such a disposition as was thus ordered, was promptly made of the three Brigades commanded, respectively, by Brigadier-generals Parsons, Scott, and George Clinton, of whom the Division commanded by Major-general Heath was then composed.[1] Indeed, notwithstanding the evident movement of the main body of the enemy, from Throgg's-neck, to the eastward, the controlling suspicion, to which we have already alluded,[2] that the real intention of General Howe was to deceive General Washington and, instead of making Pell's-neck or some other point further to the eastward the base of his operations, to effect a landing at Morrisania; to move from that point, as his base; and to take the Americans, on the Heights of Harlem, on their left flank or on their rear, induced General Washington to do little more, during that day, [*Friday, October* 18,] than to watch the movements of the enemy; to extend his line of detached parties, along the high grounds on the western bank of the Bronx-river, northward, as rapidly as the enemy should show an inclination to move, in force, in that direction; to continue the Head-quarters of the Army on the Heights of Harlem; and to hold the main body of that Army in constant readiness to move in whatever direction it should become necessary to confront and oppose the enemy. On Colonel Glover and on his Brigade, therefore, during that eventful Friday, rested the great responsibility—a greater responsibility than either the Colonel or his command had any knowledge of—of being the only armed force which was in front of the Royal Army, opposing the progress of the latter into the interior of Westchester-county: and of being the only force, of any kind, which, on that day, fired a shot on the advancing column of that Army—how well that opposition to the enemy's advance was directed and how entirely successful it was, in that opposition, have been already told and need not be repeated. Not until the dusk of the evening, nor then, until after Colonel Glover and his exhausted command had fallen back, three miles, in the direction of Dobbs's-ferry, did the powerful advance of the Royal Army venture to cross the little valley over which it had been cannonaded, by the Americans, during a large portion of the day;[3] and after its progress toward the mainland was thus resumed, it made no attempt to pursue the retreating Americans, contenting itself, on the contrary, with quietly moving eastward, toward New Rochelle, where it also bivouacked, and rested from the anxieties and the dangers to which it had been exposed,[4] the main body of the Army, meanwhile, lying on its arms, at the place of debarkation, during the whole of that day and the following night,[5] if, indeed, it did not do so until the twenty-first of October.[6]

The great service which Colonel Glover and his command had thus performed, and the great skill and the equally great bravery which they had displayed, in the discharge of that very important duty, were favorably noticed, officially, at that time;[7] and,

[1] *Memoirs of General Heath*, 72.

[2] Vide pages 232, 233, 239, ante.

[3] *Colonel Glover's letter*, "MILE SQUARE, October 22, 1776."

[4] *General Howe to Lord George Germaine*, "NEW-YORK, 30 November, "1776."

[5] "On the 18th, our army re-embarking, proceeded along the coast "about six miles further, in their boats, and then re-landed at Pell's "Point, and lay on our arms that night." ([Hall's] *History of the Civil War in America*, i., 205.)

[6] We are not insensible of the fact that General Howe, in his despatch to Lord George Germaine, dated "NEW YORK, 30 November, 1776," said "the main body advanced, immediately, and laid, that night," [*Friday, October* 18,] "upon their arms, with the Left upon a creek "opposite to East Chester and the Right near New Rochelle;" and that Sauthier's *Plan of the Operations of the King's Army* confirmed the statement. But General Washington's Manuscript *Plan of the Country* took no notice of any such occupation of the mainland, as was thus stated, previously to the twenty-first: Captain Hall, who was in the Royal Army, made no mention whatever of any movement of that Army, during the intervening period, except of that of the advance, who encountered General Glover, (*History of the Civil War in America*, i., 205;) and Stedman, who is said to have been inspired by General Sir Henry Clinton, in his *History of the American War*, (i., 212,) was equally silent, on that subject. Colonel Harrison's letter to William Duer, "CAMP ON VALENTINE'S HILLS, October 21, 1776"—"Since his "Excellency's letter of yesterday, nothing of importance has transpired, "unless the marching of the enemy, to-day, from Eastchester towards "New Rochelle, is considered in that light"—General George Clinton's *Information relating to the Enemy*, dated "October 21, 1776," in which the enemy was said to "now lay from where they first landed, extended "about one mile East of New Rochelle;" and General Washington's despatch to the Continental Congress, dated "HEAD-QUARTERS, WHITE-"PLAINS, 25 October, 1776," all clearly indicated that such a movement of the main body of the King's Army was not made on the eighteenth; and nobody has pretended that Colonel Glover confronted the entire Royal Army and held it in check, during the whole of the day, as he must have done, had that Army moved from Pell's-neck, on that day. We prefer to believe, therefore, that, although the advance and, possibly, some other detachments of that Army may have moved and occupied the country between Hutchinson's river and New Rochelle, on the eighteenth, nineteenth, and twentieth of October, "the main body" remained on Pell's-neck, until the twenty first, as stated, indirectly, by Hall and Stedman, confirmed by the testimony of General Washington.

Bolton, in his *History of Westchester-county* (original edition, i., 414; *the same*, second edition, i., 695,) informed his readers, that, "on the "eighteenth of October, 1776, Lord Howe, the British commander, took "post in the village" of New Rochelle; but it is very likely that "Lord "Howe," who was Admiral of the Fleet, remained on board one of the vessels-of-war—he, certainly, was not at New Rochelle, on the day of the debarkation of the Army, on Pell's neck.

[7] "The next day, Gen. Lee (under whose command we are) came "and publickly returned his thanks to Colonel Glover and the Officers "and soldiers of his command, for their noble spirited and soldier like "conduct, during the battle; and that nothing in his power should be

from that time until the present, with more or less minuteness and precision, they have been [illegible] those, in Europe as well as in America, who have written of the events of the Campaign, in Westchester-county, in the Autumn of 1776.[1]

It is said, with some degree of probability, then, on the morning of the twentieth of October, the second day after the enemy occupied Pell's-neck, General Washington employed Colonel Rufus Putnam, an Officer and an Engineer in whom much confidence

"wanting to serve those brave Officers and men." (*Extract of a letter from* "CAMP AT MILE SQUARE IN EAST CHESTER," dated 23 October, 1776, in *The Freeman's Journal or New-Hampshire Gazette*, Vol. I., No. 23, PORTSMOUTH, Tuesday, November 12, 1776.)

General Washington conveyed his sense of the merit of Colonel Glover and his command, in these words:

"GENERAL ORDERS.

"HEAD-QUARTERS, HARLEM HEIGHTS, October 21, 1776.

"(*Parole*, HEATH.) (*Countersigns*, SULLIVAN.)

"The hurried situation of the General, for the two last days, having "prevented him from paying that attention to Colonel Glover and the "Officers and soldiers who were with him, in the skirmish, on Friday "last, that their merit and good behaviour deserved, he flatters himself "that his thanks, though delayed, will, nevertheless, be acceptable to "them, as they are offered with great sincerity and cordiality. At the "same time, he hopes that every other part of the Army will do their "duty with equal duty * and zeal, whenever called upon; and that "neither dangers, difficulties, nor hardships will discourage soldiers en"gaged in the cause of Liberty, and contending for all that freemen "hold dear and valuable."

[1] David How, in his homely *Diary*, under that date, [*October* 18,] noticed the engagement, in these words: "18. The Regulars Landed above "Frogg's point on the main Land. Our people fought Them Killed a "great many Both sides we have not The Particulars as yet." *Lieutenant-colonel Tench Tilghman to William Lee*, "HEAD-QUARTERS, KING'S "BRIDGE, October 20, 1776," made a passing and complimentary allusion to the affair; *General Washington, through his Secretary, to the Continental Congress*, "KING'S BRIDGE, October 20, 1776, half-after one o'clock, "P.M.," gave a brief and complimentary account of the skirmish; an *Extract of a letter from Fort Lee, dated* "October 20, 1776," and published in *The Pennsylvania Journal*, No. 1768, PHILADELPHIA, Wednesday, October 23, 1776, and by General Force, in his *American Archives*, V., ii., 1136, gave a very good and generally correct account of it; another *Extract of a letter from Fort Lee, dated* "October 20," and published in the same newspaper, on the following Wednesday, also gave a good, brief description; an *Extract of a letter from an Officer*, dated "NEAR NEW "ROCHELLE (IN THE VICINITY OF NEW-YORK) October 20, 1776," made a brief and exaggerated allusion to it; an Editorial article, in a Newport newspaper of the twenty-first of October, copied by *The Freeman's Journal or New-Hampshire Gazette*, Vol. I., No. 21., PORTSMOUTH, Tuesday, November 5, 1776, and by General Force, in the *American Archives*, V., ii., 1174, contained a statement of the skirmish, giving the command to General Lee and making other serious errors; some *Information relating to the enemy, communicated to the New-York Convention*, evidently by General George Clinton, on the twenty-first of October, 1776, gave a brief description; an allusion which was made to it, with the report of a deserter as to the enemy's loss, may be seen in an *Extract of a letter from Fort Lee*, dated "October 22," and published in *The Philadelphia Evening Post*, Vol. II., No. 276, PHILADELPHIA, Saturday, October 26, 1776; with the letter, evidently written by General Glover, dated "MILE SQUARE, October 22, "1776," and published in *The Freeman's Journal or New-Hampshire Gazette*, Vol. I., No. 27, PORTSMOUTH, Tuesday, November 26, 1776, and by General Force, in the *American Archives*, V., ii., 1188, 1189, the reader is already acquainted; an *Extract of a letter from Mount Washington*, dated October 23, 1776, written by an eye-witness of the engagement, and published in *The Pennsylvania Journal*, No. 1769, PHILADELPHIA, Wednesday, October 30, 1776, confirmed the statement that the loss was largely sustained by the German troops; and informed that deserters stated the entire loss, British and German, to have amounted to "more "than eight hundred men, killed and wounded;" a brief reference was made to the skirmish, in an *Extract of a letter from East Chester*, dated October 23, published in *The Freeman's Journal or New-Hampshire Gazette*, Vol. I., No. 24, PORTSMOUTH, Tuesday, November 5, 1776; an excellent and very full description, evidently written by one who participated in the fight, appeared in an *Extract of a letter from Camp at Mile Square in East Chester*, dated 23 October, 1776, which was printed in *The Freeman's Journal or New-Hampshire Gazette*, Vol. I., No. 27, PORTSMOUTH, Tuesday, November 12, 1776, whence it was re-printed by Frank Moore, in his *Diary of the American Revolution*, i., 326, 327; *General Howe's despatch to Lord George Germaine*, dated "NEW-YORK, 24 November, 1776," contained the official report of the skirmish; Captain Hall, in his *History of the Civil War in America*, (i., 205,) made mention of it, stating, also, that the Light Infantry lost "about thirty killed and wounded," without making the slightest allusion to either the Grenadiers or the German troops; Stedman, in his *History of the American War*, (i., 211, 212,) described the skirmish, very briefly, stating "thirty-two were killed and wounded on "the side of the English," without alluding to that of any of the other troops; Judge Jones, in his *History of New York during the Revolutionary War*, (i., 122,) made only a general reference to it, among a number of skirmishes in Westchester-county, and his Editor, de Lancey, made no mention of it; Gordon, in his *History of the American Revolution*, (ii., 39,) gave a singularly inaccurate description, making General Lee the commander, in person, without naming Colonel Glover, in any way; General Heath, in his *Memoirs*, (72, 73,) mentioned it with some particularity, but without alluding to Colonel Glover, in connection with it; Judge Marshall, in his *Life of George Washington*, (ii., 4[illegible]) briefly alluded to it; Ramsay, in his *History of the American Revolution*, (Edit. London: 1791, i., 308, 309,) gave the personal command to General Lee, without alluding to Colonel Glover; Mrs. Warren, in her *Rise and Progress of the American Revolution*, (i., 327,) grouped all the operations of the Armies, while *en route* to the White Plains, without making special mention of either; Adolphus, in his *History of England*, (Second edition, ii., 28[illegible],) made honorable mention of Colonel Glover and of the engagement; Sergeant Lamb, of the Royal Welsh Fusileers, in his *Journal of Occurrences during the late American War*, (Edit. Dublin: 18[illegible]: 127,) made honorable mention of it, giving the personal command to General Lee; Paul Allen, in his *History of the American Revolution*, (i., 311, 312,) also gave the command to General Lee, requiring, however, the "whole force of the "British, in solid columns," to overcome the handful of Americans; Morse, in his *Annals of the American Revolution*, (Edit. Hartford: 1824, 262,) mentioned it, incidentally, giving the personal command to General Lee; Ramsay, in his *Life of George Washington*, (Sixth edition, 46,) did no more than to casually allude to the entire series of affairs, without particularly mentioning either of them; Dunlap, in his *History of New York*, (ii., 80,) did the same, honorably mentioning all, without selecting either, for special praise; Lossing, in his *Pictorial Field-book of the Revolution*, (original edition, ii., 820,) found room for no more than two lines of description of this gallant affair, which was a part of his subject: although he had devoted eight pages to Christopher Columbus and fourteen to Sir Walter Raleigh, Captain John Smith, and Pocahontas, which, certainly, had no connection with that subject, the American Revolution; and, in those two lines, he committed a singularly important error; Irving, in his *Life of George Washington*, (Edit. 1856, ii., 385, 386,) gave an excellent little notice of it; Bancroft, in his *History of the United States*, (original edition, ix., 177, and in the *same*, centenary edition, v., 441,) while he had been singularly precise in what had no bearing whatever on the history of the United States, dismissed the subject in less than four lines; Dawson, in his *Battles of the United States*, (i., 157,) made only an incidental allusion to it, instead of appropriating a Chapter of his work to that special subject, as he should have done; Colonel Carrington, in his *Battles of the American Revolution*, (235,) made honorable mention of the affair; the local historian, Bolton, in his *History of Westchester-county*, (original edition; i., 153, and in the *same work*, second edition, i., 215,) probably alluded to this engagement, when in each instance, he devoted two lines and a half to the subject, in the course of which, however, in each instance, the reader was gravely informed that the Royal Army was, at that time, "under Lord Howe," the Admiral commanding the Fleet. In other parts of his work, (original edition, i., 546–548; second edition, ii., 73, 74,) he presented copies of what General Heath and two of the letter-writers had written on the subject, without a single additional word, where something of description of localities, if nothing else, would have been more than ordinarily useful. *The Annual Register for* 1776: *History of Europe*, *176; Murray, in his *Impartial History of the War in America*, (Edit. Newcastle-upon-Tyne, sine anno, ii., 175); *The History of the War in America*, (Ed. Dublin: 1779, ii., 195);

* Thus printed.

was justly reposed, to make a personal reconnaissance of the enemy's strength and position.[1] It is said that, in the discharge of that service, Colonel Putnam was accompanied by Adjutant-general Reed and a guard of twenty men. It is said, also, that, from the heights of Eastchester, they saw a small body of the enemy, near the Church, in that village, but could learn nothing from the inhabitants, as the houses were all deserted. The Adjutant-general is said to have left Colonel Putnam, at that place, to attend to other duties; and that the latter requested him to take back the guard, as he thought he could succeed better, in what he had to do, by himself. It is said, also, that Colonel Putnam then disguised himself, and set out for the White Plains, a place which he had never visited; nor did he know the road which led to it. Immediately afterwards, he came to a road which turned off, to the right, and which he followed, a short distance and until he came to a house, where a woman informed him that the road he was then on led to New Rochelle; that the enemy was there; and that the latter had posted a guard, at a house, then in sight. Returning to the roadway from which he had diverged, he continued his journey towards the White Plains, and had approached "within three or four miles of that place,"[2] when he saw a house, with men about it, only a short distance from him. Before he advanced, he carefully examined the men, with his field-glass; and having ascertained that the house was a Tavern and that the men were not British soldiers, he went forward; called for some oats for his horse; and, sitting quietly down, listened to the conversation of the assembled countrymen, whom he discovered to be Whigs. From these, Colonel Putnam ascertained that a large body of the Royal Army was lying near New Rochelle, which was about eleven miles distant from the White Plains, with good roads and an open, level country between the two places; and that at the Plains, was a large quantity of American Stores, guarded by only about three hundred Militia. He ascertained, also, that a detachment of the enemy was posted near Mamaroneck, only seven miles distant from the White Plains; while, on the other side, was the Hudson-river, on which were half a dozen armed vessels of the King's Fleet, within seven miles from the same place; and he understood, at once, that the principal Magazine of Provisions for the American Army, which General Washington had ordered to be brought to the White Plains, for the greater security of it, was enclosed, on three sides, by the King's forces, and was within easy striking distance from either of those three positions. Colonel Putnam waited no longer, at the Tavern, and proceeded no further, on the road towards the White Plains; but, turning his horse towards the Bronx-river, westward from Ward's Tavern,[3] where he then was, over Ward's Bridge, he hastened back to Head-quarters, "with his "all-important discoveries." It appears that Colonel Putnam and the Adjutant-general had passed over the same ground, in the morning; and the former was surprised, therefore, when he approached the high ground, westward from the Bronx-river, to see that it was occupied by armed men; but he ascertained with his field-glass that they were Americans; and when he reached the encampment, he found it was the Brigade commanded by Brigadier-general Lord Stirling, of Major-general Spencer's Division, who had been pushed forward, in advance of the main Army, during that day, to occupy that very important pass and to fortify it.[4]

After Colonel Putnam had refreshed himself and his horse at the Head-quarters of the Brigade—as Lord Stirling was a *bon vivant* and an extravagant liver, the weary Colonel was, undoubtedly, well-refreshed—he set out for Head-quarters, by way of Yonkers, a road on which he had not previously traveled; and as it was dark, and because the country over which he was to pass was largely inhabited by those who were unfriendly to the Americans, rendering it hazardous for him to make inquiries, his journey was peculiarly dangerous. It is said, however, that he reached Head-quarters, in safety, about nine o'clock; that he was received by General Washington, who heard his verbal Report and examined the sketch of the country which he made for the illustration of the Report and

d' Auberteuil, in his *Essais historiques et politiques sur la Révolution de l' Amérique Septentrionale*, (Edit. a Bruxelles: 1782, ii., 38); Andrews, in his *History of the War with America, France, Spain, and Holland*, (Edit. London: 1786, ii., 243-245); Soulés, in his *Histoire des Troubles de l' Amérique Anglaise*, (Edit. Paris: 1787, i., 342-345); Chas and Lebrun, in their *Histoire politique et philosophique de la Révolution de l' Amérique Septentrionale*, (Edit. Paris: An ix., 1801); Colonel Humphreys, in his *Essay on the Life of Major-general Israel Putnam*, (Edit. Boston: 1818, 126, 127); Pitkin, in his *Political and Civil History of the United States*, (Ed. New Haven: 1828, i., 379); Sparks, in his *Life of George Washington*, (Edit. Boston: 1842, 194); Lossing, in his *Seventeen hundred and seventy-six*, (Edit. New York: 1847, 207); Hildreth, in his *History of the United States of America*, (First Series, iii., 134); Hamilton, in his *History of the Republic of the United States of America*, (i., 129, 130—where the enemy is made to force himself over the causeway leading from Throgg's-neck to the village of Westchester; Greene, in *The Life of Nathanael Greene*, (Edit. New York: 1867, i., 236-238); Ridpath, in his *Popular History of the United States of America*, (Edit. New York: 1880, 317); although all of them made mention of the movement of the Royal Army from Throgg's neck, made no mention whatever, of this spirited and important skirmish.

Disregarding those who made no mention of Colonel Glover and his brave command, the reader will find in the character and number of those who did recognize and describe the achievements of those brave men, on that eighteenth of October, sufficient evidence of the great importance which those achievements possessed and the great influence which they secured, both in America and in Europe, both of which are our sufficient warrant for devoting both labor and space, in our presentation of them to our readers, in as complete and as accurate a form as possible.

[1] *Memoir of Colonel Rufus Putnam*, in Hildreth's *Biographical and Historical Memoirs of the Early Settlers of Ohio*, 61-63.

[2] Probably between the present villages of Tuckahoe and Scarsdale, near the line of the Harlem Railroad.

[3] The position of that noted Tavern may be ascertained by a reference to the *Plan of the Country from Frog's Point to Croton River*, opposite page 239, ante: if we are correctly informed, the property is now owned and occupied by Hon. Silas D. Gifford, recently County Judge of Westchester-county.

[4] Vide page 258, ante.

to show the relative positions of the several bodies of the King's forces and the Magazine, at the White Plains; that the General was surprised that the Army was so greatly imperiled, "complaining, very feelingly, "of the gentlemen of New York, from whom he had "never been able to obtain a plan of the country, "and saying that it was by their advice he had or-"dered the Stores to the White Plains, as a place of "safety;" that General Greene and General George Clinton were called in, to vouch for the accuracy of the sketch; that Colonel Putnam "was charged with "a letter to Brigadier-general Lord Stirling, and "ordered immediately to his Camp, which he reach-"ed, by the same route, about two o'clock;" that, "before daylight, the Brigade was in motion, in full "march for the White Plains, where it arrived, about "nine o'clock, on the morning of the twenty-first of "October;" and that "thus was the American Army "saved by an interposition of Providence, from a "probably total destruction."

While these various movements were in progress, and while his attention to the great events which were passing immediately before him must have been close and constant, General Washington's interest in the future was not neglected. He determined, therefore, to establish a Magazine of Provisions, to the northward of the Highlands and "remote from the North River;" and the Quartermaster-general of the Army was instructed to ascertain the opinions of William Duer and Robert R. Livingston, on the subject; and, in the mean time, the former of the two, who was never absent when any opportunity for making money was presented, was ordered by the Quartermaster-general to purchase, without the slightest limitation of prices or any check whatever, as to qualities or quantities or places or times of delivery, thirty thousand bushels of Grain, one-half of it to be Corn and the other half to be Oats, one thousand tons of Hay, and five hundred tons of Rye-straw—as Robert R. Livingston was to be consulted concerning the places where all these should be delivered, it is very clear that the Quartermaster general intended that large liberty, in the expenditure of the public monies, which he had authorized, should be exercised within the Manor of Livingston, where that family and its adherents would enjoy the benefits to be derived from that questionable source, instead of expending those monies within those other portions of the State where the dominant party possessed no interest, although the former was perfectly secure from loss and the latter, very largely, were exposed to the inroads of the enemy. Instructions were also given, also without limitation, for the purchase of Horses and Oxen; and if they could not be purchased, the lucky agent was authorized to hire them, "at the most rea-"sonable rates."[1] It was for the purpose of making such opportunities as these, that the dominant faction had revolted; and in such hands as those of William Duer and the Livingstons, such opportunities never failed to be made useful, always to themselves and sometimes to the State and the Country.

There was ample reason, however, for the anxiety of General Washington, concerning Provisions for the supply of the Army, since, at the time when he ordered the establishment of a Magazine, in the upper part of Duchess-county, there were not more than fifteen hundred barrels of Flour and two hundred barrels of Pork, at Kingsbridge and on the Heights of Harlem; and there were very few live Cattle, of any kind, collected, at any place within the neighborhood of the Army. As the enemy had the control of the navigation on the Hudson-river, as well as of that on the Sound, there could not be any transportation of the much-needed supplies, by water; and the great scarcity of teams, growing more and more evident, day by day, rendered the prospect of a transportation, by land-carriage, of what would become necessary for the maintenance of the Army, exceedingly discouraging, especially since the enemy had indicated his intention to cut off the lines of communication by land, as well as those by water. The General was necessarily led, therefore, to concentrate whatever of supplies he had, at the White Plains; to request and entreat that every possible exertion should be made to have large quantities of Provisions carried to the interior parts of the country, out of the reach of the enemy, and with the utmost expedition; and to inform the Commissary-general of the Army that a failure to effect these would, he feared, he was certain, be productive of the fatal consequences attending on mutiny and plunder, adding, significantly, "indeed, the latter "will be authorized by necessity."[2]

With such testimony as this, and there is an abundance of other testimony which is even stronger in its terms, the honest historian of these events finds great difficulty in reconciling the facts with the persistent assertion that the War of the Revolution was originated by the great body of the Colonists arising, *en masse*, for the protection of their several properties and homes and families from outrages threatened or inflicted by a foreign tyrant; that it was conducted by that same great body of people, through agencies of its own appointment and under its control, always unselfishly and with nothing else than the common weal in view; and that the willing hands and the patriotic hearts of the entire body of the people were in accord with the patriotism of the Army which it had created, which it was sustaining with all which it possessed, and on which, alone, all its hopes for security, for happiness, for prosperity, and for peace, were rested. Surely, where mutiny and plundering were officially threatened in default of

[1] *Quartermaster-general Mifflin to William Duer*, "MOUNT WASHINGTON, "October 20, 1776."

[2] *General Washington to Colonel Joseph Trumbull, Commissary-general of Provisions*, "HEAD-QUARTERS, KING'S BRIDGE, October 20, 1776.

contributions, forced contributions, [illegible] and expected, there could not have been much sympathy between the Army and the body of the people; and, surely, in that condition of the popular feeling, the Army can scarcely be said, in truth, to have been fighting for the cause of the country, at large, but, on the contrary, as Armies have always fought, at the expense of the body of the people, of the working-bees of the hive, for the promotion, only, of the private ends and the private aims and the private interests of an individual or of a family or of a faction or of a party, neither of them a producer nor anything else than a cumbrance and a burden on those who have labored.

It will be seen, from General Washington's anxiety concerning his supplies and concerning the lines of communication between the Army and the country, and from other evidence, that he was becoming convinced that the enemy intended to take New Rochelle for the base of his proposed operations, and, from that place, by way of the White Plains, to form his command, in a line, to the Hudson-river,[1] at Tarrytown—a plan of operations, as we have already stated,[2] which was formed, after due consideration, before General Howe had left the City of New York, as will have been seen in the disposition of the *Phœnix*, the *Roebuck*, and the *Tartar*, off Tarrytown, to cover the objective point, the right of the proposed new line, of the Army,[3] and in the selection of Mill's-creek, or New Rochelle-harbor, as the base of his operations, the left of the proposed line,[4] and, because of that new-born conviction, as early as noon, on the twentieth of October, the entire military force, except the Regiments which were intended to garrison Fort Washington, was drawn into Westchester-county; every height and pass and advantageous ground, between New Rochelle and the Hudson-river, was occupied by an American force sufficiently strong to hold it, temporarily;[5] the Head-quarters of the Army were removed from Harlem Heights to Kingsbridge;[6] and, although there are no direct testimonies on the subject, it is very evident that, at least as early as the close of the twentieth of October, the proper dispositions for the movement of the main body of the Army—the garrison of Fort Washington and a guard at the barracks, at Fort Independence, only excepted—to the high grounds, to the northward and eastward of the White Plains, had, also, been entirely completed.

On the twentieth of October, Lieutenant-colonel Harcourt, with the greater portion of the Sixteenth Regiment of Light Dragoons—the other portion of the Regiment having embarked on a transport which had not come into port—and the whole of the Seventeenth Regiment of Light Dragoons, joined General Howe; and, on the next day, [*October* 21, 1776,] thus strengthened, the Right and Center of the Royal Army were moved to a position, about two miles to the northward of New Rochelle, on the road to the White Plains, Lieutenant-general Heister occupying the ground which had been thus abandoned, with one Brigade of British and two Brigades of Hessians, constituting the Left of the Army;[7] and, early in the morning of that day, the Queen's Rangers, a Corps of Loyalists commanded by Lieutenant-colonel Rogers, were detached and pushed forward, to take possession of Mamaroneck,[8] the last-named of which places was

[1] See, also, *General Washington, through his Secretary, to the President of the Continental Congress*, "KING'S BRIDGE, October 20, 1776, half-after one "o'clock, P. M."

[2] Vide page 231, ante.

[3] Vide page 229, 230, ante.

We are not insensible that Bancroft, (*History of the United States*, original edition, ix. 177; centenary edition, 1876, v., 441,) said it was as early as his fifth day on Throgg's-neck, that General Howe "gave up the hope of "getting directly in Washington's rear;" and that, in consequence of that disappointment and at that time, "he resolved to strike at White "Plains." Little credit is given to General Howe and the very able Officers whom he commanded, by any one who can really suppose they would open a Campaign, or even a series of important movements, without having, previously, formed a plan, as carefully and as intelligently constructed as possible, for the general guidance of the operations of the Army; and if from nothing else, the selection of Tarrytown and New Rochelle-harbor, as the two extremes of the proposed line, while the Army was yet unknown on Throgg's-neck, might have indicated to a less experienced reader than the venerable ex-Secretary of War, that the proposed line from New Rochelle, by way of the White Plains, to Tarrytown, was vastly more, in the military operations of the Royal Army, than a sudden inspiration which sprung up to cheer the disappointed General, when, on the sixteenth of October, the latter is alleged to have given up all hope of getting in the rear of the Americans—the whole of it a finely constructed creation of the venerable historian's peculiarly lively and poetical imagination.

There is an abundance of testimony showing that General Howe's original purpose was to take Tarrytown and New Rochelle, as the extremes of his proposed lines; and, because the venerable historian did not appear to have been governed by it, preferring, rather, to pay deference to a phantom of his own creation, it must have been that he did not understand it. Whatever it may have been which inspired the historian, however, what he wrote, on the subject under notice, is not historical, although it bears the name of History.

[4] Vide page 231, note 7, ante.

[5] *General Washington, through his Secretary, to the Congress*, "KING'S "BRIDGE, October 20, 1776, half-after one o'clock, P.M."

[6] Sparks, (*Writings of George Washington*, iv., 152, note,) said, "Head-"quarters remained at Haerlem Heights, as appears by the *Orderly Book*, "till the twenty-first;" and the *Orderly Book* of both the twentieth and the twenty-first of October gives weight to his statement. But, because the entire military force, except the garrison of Fort Washington, had been moved into Westchester-county as early as noon, on the twentieth; because General Greene had found Head-quarters, "near King's Bridge," on the evening of the nineteenth, (*Letter to the Continental Congress*, "CAMP AT FORT LEE, (LATELY FORT CONSTITUTION,) October 20, 1776;") because Lieutenant-colonel Tench Tilghman, one of the General's Aids, had addressed a letter to William Duer, dated "HEAD-QUARTERS, KING'S "BRIDGE, October 20, 1776;" because Colonel Harrison, the General's Secretary, had addressed a letter to the President of the Continental Congress, dated "KING'S BRIDGE, October 20, 1776, half-after one o'clock, "P.M.;" and because General Washington, himself, had addressed a letter to Colonel Joseph Trumbull, Commissary-general of Provisions, dated, "HEAD-QUARTERS, KING'S BRIDGE, October 20, 1776," we prefer to consider the *Orderly Book*—which was in evident disorder, from the eighteenth until the twenty-third (only a single entry appearing in it, during that long interval)—and, necessarily, Doctor Sparks, to have been in error; and that Head-quarters were really at or very near to Kingsbridge, as early as the afternoon of the nineteenth.

[7] Sauthier's *Plan of the Operations of the King's Army*.

[8] *General Howe to Lord George Germaine*, "NEW-YORK, 30 November, "1776;" [Hall's] *History of the Civil War in America*, i., 205; Stedman's *History of the American War*, i., 212; Gordon's *History of the American Revolution*, ii., 339; Sauthier's *Plan of the Operations of the King's Army; Plan of the Country from Frog's Point to Croton River*; etc.

shamefully abandoned by the Americans who were posted there on the approach of the enemy; and that, "not for want of numbers, but for want of a "good Officer to lead the men."[1]

When the intelligence of the enemy's movements, on the twenty-first of October, was received at Head-quarters, which had been removed to Valentine's-hill, General Washington was absent, on a tour of inspection.[2] Evidently aroused by the information which he had received, on the preceding evening, from Colonel Putnam, he had left, early in the morning of that day, to visit the posts on the left of the American line and at the White Plains; and when the express arrived with the very important intelligence of the enemy's movements, it was immediately transmitted to him, by his Secretary, Colonel Harrison,[3] although he was evidently quite well informed of those movements, even of that towards Mamaroneck,[4] from other sources of intelligence.

While the General was at the White Plains, on that tour of inspection, [*October* 21, 1776,] he personally examined the Stores which had been accumulated at that place, and renewed his earnest entreaties[5] with the Commissary-general of Provisions to supply the posts in that vicinity, in time, with Flour and Beef, for present use; to form other Magazines of Provisions, "in secure places, removed from the wa-"ter, in Connecticut and at such others as were men-"tioned in my last, and circumstances may direct."[6] From the same place, the General ordered the Officer in command, at Mamaroneck, to make the best stand he could, with the troops under his command, against the enemy; and told him of his intention to order an attack on the enemy's flank[7]—how little the General thought that, at that very time, the Officer whom he was thus addressing had shown himself to be only a contemptible poltroon.[8] At the same time, he ordered Colonel Lachlan McIntosh, who was then in Connecticut, with two Regiments of Massachusetts troops, preparing to make a movement against the enemy, on Long Island, to suspend that proposed expedition, and, with Lieutenant-colonel Livingston, who was in the same State, with a considerable force, to march, immediately, towards Byram-river—that which forms the boundary between the States of New York and Connecticut, near the Sound—and to receive orders, on his arrival at the river, from Brigadier-general Lord Stirling, then at the White Plains, for the disposition of the men under his command.[9]

While the Commander-in-chief was thus employed, on the extreme left of the American line, General Howe having been equally active, during the same period, only a few miles distant,[10] the extreme right of that line, at Kingsbridge, was, also, the scene of bustle and active preparation for a movement—Orders had been issued for the movement of the Division commanded by Major-general Heath, then occupying the grounds around Kingsbridge and, thence, northward, to Valentine's-hill, to the extreme left of the proposed line, in the new position, to the northward and eastward of the White Plains, which had been selected for the immediate occupation of the Army.[11] That movement, as we have said,[12] had evidently been determined on, at least as early as during the preceding night, after the return of Colonel Putnam, and was not consequent on either the movement of the Royal Army, during the same morning, or the observations of General Washington, on his tour of inspection; but there was, evidently, some cause for the eight hours of delay, beyond the hour appointed for the movement of the Division;[13] and the extreme scarcity of Teams, for any purpose, as we have already stated,[14] which was producing great anxiety and trouble, throughout the entire Army, may have caused the delay.

The Division commanded by Major-general Heath, as we have said, (except General George Clinton, with the Regiments commanded, respectively, by Colonels Nicolls, Pawling, Graham, and Swartwout,) was ordered to move, left in front, at eight o'clock in the morning, if possible: the advance-guard was to consist of one hundred men, taken from General Scott's Brigade; and was to be followed by the heavy artillery, of which two heavy iron twelve-pounders were to be moved with that Division: the column was to follow, in platoons or by file, the six and three-pound guns to be moved between the first and second and between the third and fourth Regiments of each Brigade: each Regiment was ordered to throw out a flank-guard: and General Parsons was ordered to

---

1 *General Washington to Colonel Lachlan McIntosh of Georgia*, "WHITE-"PLAINS, October 21, 1776;" *Lieutenant-colonel Tilghman to William Duer*, "HEAD-QUARTERS, VALENTINE'S-HILL, 22 Oct., 1776."

2 *Colonel R. H. Harrison to William Duer*, "CAMP ON VALENTINE'S-"HILL, October 21, 1776;" *Extract to the Continental Congress*, "HEAD-"QUARTERS, VALENTINE'S-HILL, October 21, 1776;" *Memoirs of General Heath*, 73, 74.

3 *Colonel R. H. Harrison to William Duer*, "CAMP ON VALENTINE'S-"HILL, October 21, 1776."

4 *General Washington to Major Zebulel Rogers*, "WHITE-PLAINS, Octo-"ber 21, 1776."

5 "I have no reason, either from information or observation, to alter "my opinion of yesterday, and, therefore, again and again entreat your "every exertion to supply these posts, in time, with Flour and Beef for "present use," were his words.

6 *General Washington to Colonel Jos. Trumbull, Commissary-general of Provisions*, "WHITE-PLAINS, October 21, 1776."

7 *General Washington to Major Zebulel Rogers*, "WHITE-PLAINS, Octo-"ber 21, 1776."

8 *General Washington to Colonel McIntosh*, "WHITE-PLAINS, October "21, 1776."

9 *General Washington to Colonel McIntosh*, "WHITE-PLAINS, October 21, "1776."

10 Two miles from New Rochelle, say nine miles from the White Plains.

11 *Division Orders*, "KING'S BRIDGE, October 21, 1776."

12 Vide page 219, ante.

13 The Division was ordered to march from the left, near Valentine's, "if possible, at eight o'clock, this morning." (*Division Orders*, "KING'S "BRIDGE, October 21, 1776:") it was not until "about 4 o'clock, P.M. "our General's Division moved from above Kingsbridge," (*Memoirs of General Heath*, 73).

14 Vide page 239, ante.

furnish a rear-guard of fifty men. Each of the Brigades of the Division was to have a [illegible] of Tools, which was ordered to be moved with the heavy artillery. A number of the Spears which were at Fort Independence was to be loaded on each wagon, with the Tools; and Colonel Thomas and Colonel Drake were respectively ordered to send to each of the Regiments of the Division, a Guide, who was well acquainted with the road to the White Plains and with the vicinity of that place. It was ordered, in case the Division should be attacked, while on its march, that the line should be instantly formed; with the reserves at one hundred paces distant, in the rear; with the light artillery as it was posted on the march; and with the heavy artillery posted on the nearest commanding height and covered by the Regiment commanded by Colonel Prescott. General George Clinton, with all the Regiments of his command, except the Westchester-county Regiment commanded by Colonel Thomas, was ordered to remain where he was then posted, until the afternoon, and to forward all the Stores, Provisions, etc., which would not be required for the use of the detachment which was to be left in the barracks, in Fort Independence; after which he was to move his Brigade, on the Albany road, as far as Dobbs's Ferry, where he would receive his Baggage, etc., from the boats on which they had been forwarded; and to join the Division, at the White Plains, without delay. A detachment of six hundred men, under the command of Colonel Lasher, was ordered to remain, near Kingsbridge, until further orders—two hundred and fifty of the number were to occupy the barracks of Colonel Thomas's Regiment; fifty were to be posted in Colonel Swartwout's regimental barracks; fifty were to be posted in General Scott's Brigade barracks; fifty were to occupy the regimental barracks of Colonel Prescott; fifty were to occupy the barracks of Colonel Pawling's Regiment; fifty were to be posted in the barracks of Colonel Nicoll's Regiment; and the remaining fifty were to be posted in the barracks of Colonel Graham's Regiment—and it was also ordered to mount the proper guards and pickets; and to establish alarm-posts, in the different works. The guards then posted at Morrisania were to be called in, during the evening of that day, and to follow the Division, on the following morning; and a small guard, evidently to be supplied from the detachment at Fort Independence, was to be continually posted on the high grounds, toward Morrisania, for the security of the detachment.[1] All these specific Orders, which were evidently issued much earlier than eight o'clock in the morning, were unquestionably obeyed, as far as they could be obeyed, with entire precision and promptitude; but, nevertheless, it was not until about four o'clock, in the afternoon of that October day, that the Division was enabled to move; not until eight o'clock in the evening, that it passed Headquarters, on Valentine's-hill; and, after a tedious and wearisome night-march, not until four o'clock, on the following morning—that of Tuesday, the twenty-second of October—that it reached Chatterton's-hill, the last of the line of entrenched works, near the village of the White Plains. During the same day, General Heath moved the Division to the high ground, to the northward of the little village; and, there, it evidently rested from the fatigue which was consequent on the laborious movements of the preceding thirty-six hours.[2]

It will be seen by the reader, that the Division which was thus pushed forward, to the White Plains, was in light marching order, evidently taking with it no more than the personal Baggage of the Officers and men; that it was pushed forward, with all possible expedition, if it may not properly be said to have been by a forced march; and that it was not halted on its line of march, until it had reached Chatterton's-hill. It had moved along the roadway leading to the White Plains, behind and under cover of the line of entrenched camps, stretched along the high grounds, westward from the Bronx-river, from Valentine's-hill, on the South, to the White Plains, on the North, which had, already, been thrown up and occupied,[3] and it reached the Plains and rested on the high grounds, at that place; and it was subsequently moved into the

[1] *Division Orders*, "KING'S BRIDGE, October 21, 1776."

[2] *Memoirs of General Heath*, 73–75.

[3] Sauthier's *Plan of the Operations of the King's Army; Plan of the Country from Fort Fish to Croton River*; Dawson's *Military Retreats through Westchester-county*, in 1776, 35–37; etc.

We are not insensible of the fact that, in this instance, the greater number of those who have preceded us, in writing of that military retreat of the Americans, have maintained that those defensive works were thrown up by the retreating Army, on its march to the White Plains, instead of by detachments moved forward, for that specific purpose, before the retreat of the main body, from Kingsbridge, had been fully determined on. Among those from whom we have thus dissented, are the despatch of General Howe to Lord George Germaine, "NEW-YORK, "30 November, 1776;" *Annual Register for* 1776: History of Europe, *177; *History of the War in America*, Dublin: 1779, i., 164; [Hall's] *History of the Civil War in America*, i., 207; Gordon's *History of the American Revolution*, ii., 339; Stedman's *History of the American War*, i., 242; Marshall's *Life of George Washington*, ii., 50[illegible]; Andrews's *History of the War*, ii., 244; Murray's *Impartial History of the War in America*, ii., 177; Ramsay's *History of the American Revolution*, i., 330; Morse's *Annals of the American Revolution*, 2[illegible]; Sparks's *Life of George Washington*, 195; Irving's *Life of George Washington*, ii., 3[illegible], 285; Hildreth's *History of the Republic*, i., 150; Lossing's *Pictorial Field-book of the American Revolution*, ii., 821; Carrington's *Battles of the American Revolution*, 236, etc.; but we have preferred the testimony of *Division Orders* for the movement of the troops, the narrative of the movement which was written by the Major-general commanding the Division, the official Maps of the movement drawn by both the American and the Royal Engineers, and our own well-settled convictions of the improbability that the main Army had been employed in throwing up entrenchments or that its laborious retreat to the Plains was made more laborious by continuous halts for the purpose of throwing up earthworks, for any purpose. When the retreat was originally determined on, the necessity for a prompt and immediate occupation of the new-selected position was too evident to admit of any such halts, for any such purposes; and, in the great scarcity of Teams for the removal of the Stores and Baggage and Artillery, which required the men to take the places of beasts of burden, in dragging and carrying what needed to be transported, the main body of the Army needed no additional labor, nor is it in the slightest degree probable that any such additional labor was really imposed on it.

position which had been assigned for it, on the extreme left of the proposed line of the Army, its left resting on a "deep hollow, through which ran a small "brook,[1] which came from a mill-pond,[2] a little above."[3] On the eastern, or opposite side, of that "deep hollow," "there was a very commanding ground," from which the Division could have been enfiladed;[4] and the ground occupied by the Division, descended, gradually, from the extreme left to the right of the line.[5]

On the high ground, on the opposite side of the "deep hollow," General Heath posted the Regiment of New York troops commanded by Colonel William Malcolm, and Lieutenant Fenno of the Artillery, the latter with a field-piece, with instructions to occupy a position in the skirt of the wood which covered the upper portion of the high ground, "at the South brow "of the hill;" and there, that covering party remained, until the American Army retreated into the high grounds of Northeastle.[6]

While the Division commanded by General Heath was thus hurrying, by a forced march, towards the White Plains, during the night of the twenty-first of October, another portion of the American Army was engaged in a brilliant dash on the enemy's outpost, at Mamaroneck.

It will be remembered that, on the twenty-first of October, when the Right and Center of the main body of the Royal Army were moved forward to a position between New Rochelle and the White Plains, the Queen's Rangers, a select body of Loyalists, commanded by the celebrated partisan, Lieutenant-colonel Robert Rogers,[7] were pushed forward to Mamaroneck, which they had occupied early in the morning of that day.[8]

It will be remembered, also, that while General Washington was at the White Plains, on the twenty-first of October, he had received information of that occupation of Mamaroneck; and that he had determined to make an attack on the Queen's Rangers who were posted there.[9] In accordance with that determination and with Orders which were undoubtedly issued by General Washington,[10] General Lord Stirling, who had reached the White Plains, with his command, during the morning of that day, detached Major Green, with one hundred and fifty men from the First and Third Virginia Regiments, and Colonel John Haslet, with six hundred men from his own—the Delaware—and other Regiments, with orders to fall on the Rangers, during the coming night. The movement was made with good judgment and ability; the Rangers were entirely surprised, through the carelessness of their sentries; and, as was stated by an Officer in the Royal Army,[11] they were "very roughly "handled." In consequence of the bad conduct of the guides whom Colonel Haslet had employed,[12] however, the success was not as complete as it probably would have been, had the guides done their duty properly. As it was, Colonel Haslet and his gallant command handled the Rangers "very roughly," killing and wounding a considerable number;[13] carrying back, to the White Plains, thirty-six prisoners,[14] and

---

[1] Then and now known as the Mamaroneck-river.

[2] Then known as "Horton's pond;" now known as "St. Mary's "Lake."

[3] The entire property included in this portion of our narrative, is now owned by Charles Deutermann, Esq.

[4] Now forming a portion of what is known as "The Underhill "Farm."

[5] This description of the ground occupied by the Division commanded by General Heath, has been taken, largely in his own words, from his *Memoirs*, evidently written by himself, page 75. For our statements concerning the present names and owners of the several properties referred to, we are indebted to the Hon. J. O. Dykman, Judge of the Supreme Court of the State of New York, and a resident of the White Plains.

[6] *Memoirs of General Heath*, 75.

[7] The Queen's Rangers, subsequently so widely known, had been raised in Connecticut and the vicinity of New York, for the duties which their name implied; and, at the time of which we write, they were commanded by Lieutenant-colonel Robert Rogers, who had so much distinguished himself as a partisan, on the frontiers, during the War with France. They were "all Americans, and all Loyalists."—(Simcoe's *Journal of the Operations of the Queen's Rangers*, 18.)

These Rangers were said, by the biographer of their distinguished Commandant, of a later period, to have been "disciplined, not for parade, but "for active service. They were never to march in *slow* time; were directed "to fire with precision and steadiness; to wield the bayonet with force "and effect; to disperse and rally with rapidity. In short, in the in-"structions for the management of the Corps, its commander seems to "have anticipated the more modern tactics of the French Army."—(*Memoir of Lieutenant-colonel Simcoe*,—Simcoe's *Journal of the Operations of the Queen's Rangers*, viii.)

[8] *General Washington to Colonel Lachlan McIntosh, of Georgia*, "WHITE-"PLAINS, October 21, 1776;" *the same to Major Zabdiel Rogers*, "WHITE-PLAINS, October 21, 1776;" *Extract of a letter from a General Officer, dated* "MOUNT WASHINGTON, October 23, 1776;" *General Howe to Lord George Germaine*, "NEW-YORK, 30 November, 1776;" [Hall's] *History of the Civil War in America*, i., 205; Stedman's *History of the American War*, i., 212; Gordon's *History of the American Revolution*, ii., 359; Santhier's *Plan of the Operations of the King's Army; Plan of the Country from Frog's Point to Croton River*; etc.

[9] Vide page 250, ante.

[10] In Lieutenant-colonel Tilghman's letter to his father, dated "VAL-"ENTINE's-HILL 4 MILES FROM KINGSBRIDGE 22 October 1776," it is expressly stated that "the General"—by which term he referred to General Washington, whose Aide-de-Camp he was and with whom he had been, while the Commander-in-Chief was at the White Plains—"detached "Major Green * * * to fall upon Rogers in the Night, which they "did," etc.

[11] [Hall's] *History of the Civil War in America*, i., 205.

[12] Lieutenant-colonel Tilghman, in the letter to his father, to which we have already referred, stated that "had not the Guides posted Haslet "wrong the whole party consisting of 400 must have fallen into our "Hands;" and Colonel Haslet, in his Letter to General Cæsar Rodney, dated "October 28, 1776," said, "had not our guides deserted us on the "first outset he and his whole party must have been taken."

See, also, *General Washington, through his Secretary, to Governor Trumbull*, "CAMP ON VALENTINE'S-HILL, October 22, 1776."

[13] In Lieutenant-colonel Tilghman's letter to his father, already mentioned, it is said "they counted 25 killed in one Orchard, how many got "off wounded we dont know;" and in Colonel Haslet's letter to General Rodney, already referred to, it was said, "his Lieutenant and a number "of others were left dead on the spot."

[14] *Lieutenant-colonel Tilghman to his father*, "VALENTINE'S-HILL 4 MILES "FROM KINGSBRIDGE, 22 October, 1776;" *Colonel Haslet to General Rodney*, "WHITE-PLAINS, October 28, 1776;" etc.

A list of thirty-one of those prisoners may be seen in Force's *American Archives*, V., ii., 1203; but the evident slaughter of the names has made that record useless to every one who is unacquainted with the names of

including, among the trophies of their bravery, "a "pair of Colors, sixty stand of Arms, and a variety of "plunder,"[1] among the latter of which were "a good "many Blankets."[2] On the side of the Americans, "three or four were left, dead, and about fifteen were "wounded, among the latter, Major Green, of the "Second Virginia Regiment, wounded in the shoul-"der, and Captain Pope, who acted as Major, and "behaved with great bravery, wounded in the leg."[3] General Lord Stirling is said to have been "so highly "pleased with the success of the expedition, that he "thanked Colonel Haslet and his command, pub-"licly, on the parade."[4]

On the twenty-second of October, General Howe strengthened his outpost, at Mamaroneck, which Colonel Haslet had so rudely assaulted, during the preceding night, by moving the Sixth Brigade of British troops, commanded by Brigadier-general Agnew, to that place;[5] and, on the same day, Lieutenant-general Knyphausen, with the Second Division of the Hessians and the Regiment of Waldeckers, numbering eight thousand men, who had arrived at New York, on the eighteenth,[6] landed on Myers-point, now known as Davenport's-neck, near New Rochelle,[7] to which place they had been taken, from the City of New York, on the flatboats of the Army.[8]

As all intercourse between the City of New York and the Army, which was so exceedingly important, depended on the King's troops and Navy being masters of the Sound, armed vessels were stationed, at short distances from each other, from Hell-gate to New Rochelle; and every possible assistance was afforded by Admiral Lord Howe, to facilitate the movements of the Army commanded by his brother. Indeed, in the words of one of the best-informed writers of the history of those operations of the King's Navy, himself an Officer of the Army and a personal witness of what he described, "a vigor "and exertion, unequalled in any former expedi-"tion, prevailed through all classes in the Navy, "extinguishing jealousies, and banishing all those "ideas of pre-eminence and rank that sometimes sub-"sist between the Fleet and the Army; and which

families of whom they were probably members. As many of them appear to have been of Westchester-county origin, we append the list, corrected as far as we have been able to correct it:

*Joseph Dean,	*Jonathan Austin,
*Stephen Law,	Francis Basley,
*Elijah Carle,	James Sharp,
*John Angevine,	Solomon Parent,
*Joseph Carle,	Jonathan Eddy,
Walter Brown,	*Stephen Travis,
Gilbert Myers,	*James Cannady,†
*Frederic Devoe,	*Moses Travis,
David Lawrence,	Abraham Brown,
*James Angevine,	*Elnathan Appleby,
John Charlick,	Jedediah Davis,
Jeremiah Wood,	Jacob Cadwell Burr,
Reuben Stivers,	James Meison, [*Nelson?*]
*David Travis,	Noah Brown,
John Worden,	William Washburn.
*Elijah Bartow,	

[1] *Colonel Haslet to General Rodney*, "WHITE-PLAINS, October 28, 1776."

[2] *Lieutenant-colonel Tilghman to his father*, "VALENTINE'S-HILL, 4 MILES "FROM KINGSBRIDGE, 22 October, 1776."

[3] *Colonel Haslet to General Rodney*, "WHITE-PLAINS, October 28, 1776."

[4] Those who shall desire to learn more of this affair are referred to *General Washington's letter to Governor Trumbull*, "CAMP ON VALEN-"TINE'S-HILL, October 22, 1776;" *the same, to the Continental Congress*, "HEAD-QUARTERS, WHITE-PLAINS, 25 October, 1776;" *Extract of a letter from Fort Lee*, dated "October 22," in *The Philadelphia Evening Post*, Vol. II., No. 276, "PHILADELPHIA, Saturday, October 26, 1776;" *Extract of a letter from a General Officer*, dated "MOUNT WASHINGTON, "October 23, 1776," in *The Pennsylvania Journal*, No. 1769, "PHILADEL-"PHIA, Wednesday, October 30, 1776," and in Force's *American Archives*, V., ii., 1203; *Abram Clark to Colonel Dayton*, "ELIZABETHTOWN, October "26, 1776;" *Extract from a letter published by the Continental Congress*, in *The Pennsylvania Journal*, No. 1770, "PHILADELPHIA, Wednesday, "November 6, 1776;" *General Howe to Lord George Germaine*, "NEW-"YORK, 30 November, 1776;" [Hall's] *History of the Civil War in America*, i., 205; Gordon's *History of the American Revolution*, ii., 339; *Memoirs of General Heath*, 74, 75; etc.

Bolton, in his *History of Westchester-county*, (original edition, i., 311; second edition, i., 433) prefaced to General Heath's mention of this affair (except the date, which the latter had correctly stated,) the singular information that it occurred on "the day previous to the battle at White "Plains," [*October 27.*] and that the command of the Americans was held by Colonel Smallwood, of the Maryland Line of the Continental Army.

Bancroft, in his *History of the United States*, (original edition, ix., 178; centenary edition, v. 142,) regarded the Rangers as only "a picket of "Rogers's Regiment of Rangers," notwithstanding General Howe had described it, definitely, as a detachment of the entire "Corps of Ran-"gers," not a portion of it, only, which had been sent forward, "to take possession of Mamaroneck;" and no one, of either Army, considered it as only a picket, or it would not have been mentioned in the despatches of both the Generals commanding nor have found a place on either of the official Maps of the Campaign.

[5] *General Howe to Lord George Germaine*, "NEW-YORK, November 30, "1776;" [Hall's] *History of the Civil War in America*, i., 205; Sauthier's *Plan of the Operations of the King's Army; A Plan of the Country from Frog's Point to Croton River*; etc.

[6] "NEW-YORK, October 21, 1776. On Friday sixty-five sail of vessels, "under convoy of the Diamond and Ambuscade, with the second divis-"ion of the Hessians and one thousand Waldeckers, under the command "of the Generals Knyphausen and Schmidtz, and a number of recruits for "the British troops, in all about eight thousand effective men, arrived "off Sandy-Hook. They sailed from Plymouth Sound, the 27th of July. "In the fleet are several victuallers and vessels laden with draught-"horses for the train and baggage of the Army." (*The New-York Gazette and Weekly Mercury*, No. 1304, NEW-YORK, Monday, October 21, 1776.)

See, also, *Lord George Germaine to General Howe*, "WHITEHALL, 21 "June, 1776."

[7] *General Howe to Lord George Germaine*, "NEW-YORK, November 30, "1776;" [Hall's] *History of the Civil War in America*, i., 206; Sauthier's *Plan of the Operations of the King's Army*; Gordon's *History of the American Revolution*, ii., 339; *Plan of the Country from Frog's Point to Croton River*; etc.

Bolton, in his *History of Westchester-county*, (original edition, i., 440; second edition, i., 658) said General Knyphausen landed on Myers-point, or Davenport's neck, "ten days previous to the battle of White-Plains," [*October 28.*] the day on which he had reached Sandy-hook; and in the first of the two editions, he cited, as his authority, Stedman's *History of the American War*, in which there is not the slightest mention of the date of the debarkation of the Division, beyond the fact that it was after the twenty-first of October, seven days before the action on Chatterton's-hill.

[8] Admiral Lord Howe to Mr. Stephens, Secretary to the Admiralty, "EAGLE, OFF NEW-YORK, November 23, 1776."

* Those who are thus designated (*) were, probably, of Westchester-county families.

† James Cannady was one of the Bedford Company who had served throughout the Campaign of 1775, under Colonel James Holmes, (*this page 101, ante.*)

"have too often fatally contributed to national "dishonor."[1]

During the following night, [*Tuesday, October* 22,] the Division of the American Army which was commanded by Major-general Sullivan reached the White Plains,[2] and, probably, occupied a position in the proposed new line of the Army, on the right of that already occupied by the Division commanded by Major-general Heath; although we have not found any information, on that subject, among the contemporary authorities.[3]

While General Sullivan and his command were thus moving towards the White Plains, a raid was made from the Regiment which occupied the entrenched Camp at Mile-Square, in which a Corporal and two Privates, with the approval of the Colonel, "went out to see what they could pick up," and succeeded in bringing in "a number of fat Cattle," without pretending, however, that they had belonged to the King's Army;[4] and, on the afternoon of the following day, [*Wednesday, October* 23,] the same small party went out, again, but in a different direction—"going "directly to the rear of the Hessian Camp," [*near East Chester,*] "they went into a house where they "washed for the Officers, and were bringing off three "tubs of Shirts, when the man of the house informed "the Camp." The marauders were, of course, compelled to retreat; but, meeting some of their comrades,—probably the party referred to in the following paragraph,—they rallied, drove back their Hessian pursuers, killed the Major who commanded the latter—from whom they took his Commission and ten guineas, in money—and a number of others, and captured three prisoners,[5] evidently securing to themselves, also, very great credit.

During the same day, [*Wednesday, October* 23,] Colonel Glover, commanding the Brigade of which Brigadier-general James Clinton was the commander—the same who had distinguished themselves on the preceding Friday—sent out a party, mostly composed of men belonging to his own Regiment, to see what was to be seen and do what they could do. It is said that that Scouting-party met a body of the enemy and attacked it, killing, as has been already stated, twelve Hessians—one of them a Field-officer, on horseback—and taking three prisoners, besides the horse of the Officer who was killed; with the loss of one man, of Colonel Baldwin's Regiment, who was mortally wounded.[6]

On the same day, [*Wednesday, October* 23,] the Head-quarters of the Army were established "on the "Plain, near the cross-roads," at the White Plains.[7]

During the entire period succeeding the determination to move the main body of the American Army from the Heights of Harlem to the White Plains, there were the most active preparations to secure a successful retreat, throughout every portion of the Army. It is said the Mortars, some of the Cannon, a portion of General Washington's Baggage, and some of the Sick had been taken to the western side of the Hudson-river, before that determination was made;[8] on the morning of the twenty-second, the Sick who had not been sent over the Hudson-river, were sent

---

[1] [Hall's] *History of the Civil War in America*, i., 206.

[2] *Memoirs of General Heath*, 75.

[3] It is one of the singular portions of the history of that eventful Campaign, that the only mention which we have found, concerning General Sullivan's services, as Major-general commanding one of the great Divisions of the American Army, in Westchester-county, is that merely incidental remark, by General Heath, to which we have referred. There appears, also, in the manuscript papers of General Sullivan, which we have carefully examined, personally, next to nothing on the subject; there is nothing in the carefully-prepared *Memoir* of him, by his faithful biographer, Hon. Thomas C. Amory, which throws the faintest light on the subject; and Mr. Amory, whom it is our privilege to number among our oldest and dearest personal friends, is entirely unable to afford the slightest information.

In view of the fact that he was placed in command of a great Division of the Army, while older and more pretentious Major-generals were left in less important positions, it cannot be pretended that that silence was produced by any want of respect for either his military character or his military services.

[4] *Extract of a letter from* "Camp at Mile Square in Eastchester," dated "23 October, 1776," published in *The Freeman's Journal or New-Hampshire Gazette*, Volume I., Number 25, Portsmouth, Tuesday, November 12, 1776.

[5] Ibid.

In Lieutenant-colonel Tench Tilghman's letter to William Duer, dated "Head-quarters, White-Plains, October 23, 1776," the narrative was differently told, giving the entire credit for the insignificant affair to General Lee, as was usually done, in such cases, and stating that it occurred on the evening of the twenty-second; and an *Extract of a letter from Head-quarters*, published, officially, by the Congress, "October 25, "1776," and copied into *The Pennsylvania Journal*, No. 1770, Philadelphia, Wednesday, November 6, 1776, stated that the affair occurred on Wednesday, the twenty-third of October, as stated in the text; that the supporting party belonged to Colonel Hand's Regiment of Riflemen, instead of to Colonel Glover's Regiment; that the Americans buried ten of the Hessians on the field; and that the only loss sustained by the Americans was "one lad wounded, supposed mortally." A *letter from a Gentleman in the Army, dated* "Camp near the Mills, about "three miles North of the White Plains, November 1, 1776," published in Force's *American Archives*, V., iii., 473, stated that "our people "buried thirteen Hessians left dead on the field;" that "one wounded "Lieutenant was taken;" that, "although we had not one man killed "on the ground," we had "six or eight wounded, but one, it is thought, "mortally;" and that the Major's Commission was found on the ground; "but whether it belonged to any of the slain or to some Officer "who might be wounded and carried off, they could not determine."

[6] Colonel Glover's letter, dated "Mile-Square, October 22,* 1776," published in *The Freeman's Journal and New-Hampshire Gazette*, Vol. I., No. 27, Portsmouth, Tuesday, November 26, 1776.

[7] Doctor Sparks, in the *Writings of George Washington*, iv., 152, note; *Memoir of General Heath*, 75.

Compare, also, *Lieutenant-colonel Tilghman to the New York Convention*, "Head-quarters, Valentine's-Hill, October 22, 1776," with *the same to William Duer*, "Head-quarters, White-Plains, October 23, 1776."

[8] *Extract of a letter from Fort Lee*, dated "October 20, 1776," published in *The Pennsylvania Journal*, No. 1769, Philadelphia, Wednesday, October 30, 1776.

See, also, *General Washington to General Greene*, "White-Plains, "November 7, 1776;" *General Washington to General Lee*, "Peekskill, "November 12, 1776;" etc.

---

* The structure of this letter clearly indicates that it was written by instalments—that it was commenced on the twenty-second, and received additions on the next day, on the succeeding Sunday, and after the engagement on Chatterton's hill, which occurred on the following Monday.

This is stated in explanation of the seeming discrepancy in the date of the letter and that of the affair which is under notice.

to the White Plains, reaching that place on the following morning;[1] and the Commander-in-chief "was "almost the whole time on horseback,"[2] his Correspondence[3] and even the Orderly-books of the Army[4] clearly indicated that his personal supervision of the entire movement and of all which pertained to it was unstintingly given.

It is not now known when General Lee and his Division commenced its laborious march, towards the White Plains;[5] but it "was attended with much difficulty, for want of Wagons and Artillery-horses. "The Baggage and Artillery," it was said,[6] "were "carried or drawn off by hand. When a part was "forwarded, the other was fetched on. This was the "general way of removing the Camp-equipage and "other appendages of the Army. The few Teams "which were at hand, were no wise equal to the service; and their deficiency could be made up only "by the bodily labor of the men." Sometimes, the toiling column was in open view of the enemy, and at no considerable distance from him; and it is not explained why he did not disturb it, which he did not, although he could have easily done so, and have captured the greater number of the Cannon, Wagons, Horses, etc., which the American Army possessed. Surely the little tree-fringed Bronx did not offer any serious obstruction: surely the entrenched Camps behind which the heavily laden column was slowly marching, and which were abandoned when the column reached them, those who had occupied them falling in and increasing the strength of the moving force, did not intimidate him: rather let it be supposed that General Howe's well-settled, well-supported policy of exposing his men, in assaults on entrenchments, only when the objects to be attained by such assaults were adequate to the loss of men, in such assaults—"not wantonly to commit His Majes-"ty's troops, where the object was inadequate," was his own description of it—controlled him, as it had done in Brooklyn, while the King's Army was on Long Island. It appears, however, that General Lee varied his duties by throwing a party of his command, over the Bronx, during the night of Wednesday, the twenty-third of October, in order to beat up the outposts of the enemy; and one of these, near Ward's Tavern, between Tuckahoe and Scarsdale, and occupied by two hundred and fifty Hessians, was successfully attacked, early in the following morning, [*Thursday, October* 24,] ten of the number having been killed, and two taken prisoners;[7] and it has been stated that, reciprocally, a dash was made on the rear of the slowly moving column, somewhere in the line of march, in which, among other losses, General Lee and Captain Alexander Hamilton, the latter of the New York State Artillery, lost their Baggage.[8] The column reached the White Plains, however, on Saturday, the twenty-sixth of October, with very little loss of either Stores or Troops.[9] The movement of eight thousand men, with a train of one hundred and fifty Wagons, which "filled the road for four "miles," and with Artillery,[10] under such peculiar circumstances, with such a scarcity of the means for transportation, and in the face—often, within half a

[1] How's *Diary*, October 22 and 23, 1776.

[2] Sparks's *Writings of George Washington*, iv., 524.

[3] The twenty-second of October afforded the only letter in his published Correspondence, between the fifteenth of October and the sixth of November; and Jared Sparks, who conducted his Writings through the Press, stated, in explanation, "the unsettled state of the Army, "for several days succeeding the date of this letter," [*that of the sixth of November*,] "allowed very little leisure to the Commander-in-chief "for writing."—(*Writings of George Washington*, iv., 157, note.)

[4] In the published *Orderly-books* of the Army, there does not appear a single entry, not even of a Parole and Countersign, between the eighteenth and twenty-fifth of October.

[5] It must have been as early as the twenty-second, since the column had reached Ward's Bridge, now Tuckahoe, early on the morning of the twenty-fourth, (*Memoirs of General Heath*, 76;) it was still on its march, on the twenty-fifth, (*Colonel B. H. Harrison to the Continental Congress*, "HEAD-QUARTERS, WHITE-PLAINS, 25 October, 1776;" "I did not join the main body of the Army, at the White Plains, until the twenty-sixth, (*Memoirs of General Heath*, 75;) possibly, not until the twenty-eighth. (*General Glover's letter*, dated "MILE-SQUARE, October "22, 1776.")

[6] Gordon's *History of the American Revolution*, ii., 339, 340.

[7] Editorial in a Hartford newspaper, October 28, copied in *The Freeman's Journal and New-Hampshire Gazette*, Volume I., Number 24, PORTSMOUTH, Tuesday, November 5, 1776; *Memoirs of General Heath*, 76.

[8] Hon. James A. Hamilton, of Dobbs's-ferry, in a conversation with us, many years ago, told us that his father, Captain Alexander Hamilton, lost his Baggage, on the march of General Lee's command from Harlem Heights to the White Plains; and *The Middlesex Journal and Evening Advertiser*, No. 1209, LONDON: From Saturday, December 21, to Tuesday, December 24, 1776, contains a letter from Westchester, dated November 10, 1776, and carried to England by the *Fowey*, in which it was stated, "Upon landing at New-Rochelle, we found the church full of Salt.* Our "troops advanced to this place where we took General Lee's baggage."

In the same number of the same newspaper, another letter "*from an "Officer in Gen. Howe's Army, in the Province of New York*," dated "Nov. 11, 1776," is printed, in which it is said, "A little beyond West "Chester some of our people found a pipe of wine, directed for General "Lee, and nine puncheons of rum, which the General ordered to be "staved, least the soldiers should get drunk."

[9] *Memoirs of General Heath*, 76; Stedman's *History of the American War*, i., 212; Marshall's *Life of George Washington*, ii., 502.

Colonel John Glover, in the letter from which we have learned so much of this Campaign, and who was with General Lee, stated, evidently erroneously, that the column did not reach the White Plains until ten o'clock on Monday morning, the twenty-eighth of October, after having marched during the whole of the preceding night, (*Colonel Glover's letter*, dated "MILE-SQUARE, October 22, 1776," published in *The Freeman's Journal and New-Hampshire Gazette*, Volume I., Number 27, PORTSMOUTH, Tuesday, November 26, 1776;) but the *Letter from a Gentleman at the Army*, dated "CAMP NEAR THE MILLS, ABOUT THREE MILES NORTH OF "THE WHITE PLAINS, November 1, 1776," reprinted in Force's *American Archives*, V., iii., 471-471, stated that "General Lee reached the Plains, "and marched out, westward, between the main body of the Army and "the river," [*that is, he occupied the right of the line, between General Sullivan's command and the Bronx-river*.] "This was on the 25th and "26th of October," the author of the letter added. The official *Plan of the Country from Fort Fish Point to Croton River* and Sauthier's *Plan of the Operations, etc.*, each stated that the column was not in motion after the *twenty-seventh* of October.

There is abundant evidence, within Colonel Glover's own letter, that he was in error, two days, in this particular statement.

[10] *Colonel Glover's letter*, dated "MILE-SQUARE, October 22, 1776."

* That Salt is said to have been owned by the State of New York. It was very valuable; and the loss of it was also noticed in the American records of that period.

mile and in open sight—of an active, powerful, well-supplied, and well-disciplined enemy, [illegible] the, if with any, loss,[1] was a feat which [illegible] continues to reflect, the highest honor on both the General in command and the men whom he commanded. The entire Army, except the troops who had been left on Mount Washington and at Kingsbridge—about fourteen hundred at the former, and six hundred at the latter—was, then, concentrated at the White Plains,[2] awaiting and preparing for the great events which were rapidly approaching.

The White Plains, the place which appeared to have been designated by both the great opposing powers, as if by mutual consent, for that on which the great questions then pending between Great Britain and the united States of America were to be determined by the arbitrament of Arms, the County-seat of the ancient County of Westchester, is situated on the upper extremity of a fine plain, about twenty-six miles from the City of New York. At the time of which we write, the Village was composed of a considerable number of comfortable dwellings, scattered along the sides of two or three roads which converged at that place, two Taverns, a Presbyterian Meeting-house and a Wesleyan Methodist Chapel, and the Court-house of the County, within which, probably, all the County-offices were, also, sheltered. About three quarters of a mile westward from the principal roadway of the unpretentious little Village, flowed the small stream which was, then, as it is, now, called "The Bronx-river," forming the western boundary of the plain referred to, and separating it from "The "Manor of Philipseborough;" to the Northwest and Northeast of the Village, respectively, were bold and sometimes abrupt elevations, united by less elevated ground with a gradual descent toward the Village, the whole forming the northern boundary of "the "White Plains," below; and beyond those flanking elevations and that intervening high ground, to the northward of the Village, and not more than a mile distant from the northern extremity of it, in the Town of Northeastle, was the high and rocky ground which is, now, so well known, in history, as that to which the American Army swung back, after the action on Chatterton's-hill.[3]

The site of the encampment which the American Army occupied was on the high grounds, northwestward and northeastward from the Village, and the lower grounds between them; with covering positions, on either flank. A temporary line of works had been previously constructed along the northerly line of the road which extended from the Meeting-house of the Presbyterian-church, past the house of Jacob Purdy, to the Bronx-river[4]—that road which connected the White Plains with Dobbs's-ferry; but the entrenchments which were thrown up for the defence of the Army, occupied a line from the Bronx-river, at a point which was nearly opposite to the residence of the late William Roberts, on the right; over the summit of the hill which is to the northward of the Harlem Railroad Station, then owned by Squire Jacob Purdy, more recently by his son, Jacob, and now by numerous owners, eastward, over properties more recently owned by the younger Jacob Purdy, Daniel Dusenberry, and Alexander C. Tompkins—those of Jacob Purdy being now owned by numerous persons; those of Daniel Dusenberry, by his children; and those of Alexander C. Tompkins, by his widow—to the Post-road, which was the principal street of the Village. Occupying the Post-road was a strong earthwork, some small remains of which, bearing an old howitzer, *en barbette*, may still be seen, opposite to the residence of Mrs. Tompkins, already referred to; and, eastward from that central earthwork, up the gradual slope, over properties recently owned by Leonard Miller, John Fisher, the widow of James Fisher, and Henry Willetts—those of Leonard Miller being now owned by his two sons; those of John Fisher, by numerous persons; and those of Henry Willetts, by Charles Deutermann—to what was then known as Horton's-pond, now known as "St. Mary's "Lake," of which mention has been already made.[5] The right flank of the line was covered by the Brigades commanded, respectively, by Generals McDougal and Lord Stirling;[6] and its left was covered by

[1] "You are misinformed as to the quantity of Provisions we have lost. "When General Lee removed, he was obliged to leave eighty or ninety "barrels of Provisions, of all kinds, for want of Wagons."—(*Lieutenant-colonel Tench Tilghman to William Duer*, "HEAD-QUARTERS, WHITE-"PLAINS, October 27, 1776.")

Bancroft, in his *History of the United States*, (original edition, ix., 179; *the same*, centenary edition, v., 413,) said "sixty or seventy barrels of "Provisions" were lost. We have heard of no other loss, except that of General Lee's Baggage and Wine.

[2] *Colonel R. H. Harrison to the Continental Congress*, "HEAD-QUARTERS, WHITE-PLAINS, 25 October, 1776."

[3] Our own knowledge of the ground, as it was, more than thirty years ago, forms the groundwork of this description; and we have been favored, further, in our work of describing the topography of that vicinity, with the assistance of our valued friend of many years, Hon. Lewis C. Platt, formerly Surrogate of the County, and with that of our not less esteemed friend, Hon. J. O. Dykman, Justice of the Supreme Court, both of whom are old residents of the Village, and perfectly familiar with the ground.

[4] Very much more importance has been recently attached to this evidently temporary line of defence than it was entitled to enjoy. It was probably thrown up by the small body of Militia who had occupied that position, as a guard of the Stores which had been accumulated at that place, while the main Army occupied the Heights of Harlem; but the subsequent occupation of the ground, which, has been described in the text, by the main Army, was followed by the construction of a line of works, on the high ground, on the rear of that temporary line, the last-named of which was abandoned on Saturday, the twenty-sixth, of October.[8]

[5] This description of the line of defences occupied by the American Army, at the White Plains, was originally prepared, more than thirty years ago, with great care, from every authority which was then known to us and from information derived from aged people who have since passed away; and the present ownership of the several properties over which the line extended has been ascertained and communicated to us by Hon. Lewis C. Platt and Hon. J. O. Dykman, to whom we have already gratefully referred.

[6] "I now snatch an opportunity by the Post of informing you that

[8] "26—We Have been a moving our Tents to the top of the Hill this "Day."—(David How's *Diary*, October 26, 1776.")

the Brigades commanded, respectively, by Generals George Clinton, John Morin Scott, and Samuel H. Parsons, the two former having been posted near the Purchase,[1] and the latter at the head of King-street, near Rye pond.[2]

On the twenty-seventh of October, the small force which had been left in Fort Independence, when General Heath's Division was moved from near Kingsbridge to the White Plains,[3] was ordered to remove the Cannon and Stores from that post to Fort Washington; to burn the several Barracks which had been erected, there, with so much difficulty and at so great an expense; and, "with all possible dispatch," to move, by way of the Albany post-road, as far as Dobbs's-ferry, to the White Plains;[4] and, on the following day, without having removed the Cannon, three hundred stand of Small-arms, five tons of Bar-iron, and "a great quantity of Spears, Shot, Shells, "etc., too numerous to mention," which were within or near the Fort, and all of which were recklessly abandoned,[5] that small command, numbering not more than four hundred effective men,[6] joined the main body of the Division,[7] on the left of the line, at the White Plains. The enemy, who had occupied the entire lower portion of Westchester-county, since the American forces had been concentrated at the Plains, occupied the position, on the evening of the day on which Colonel Lasher had abandoned it.[8]

At the time of which we write, judging from *The General Returns of the Army*, dated on the third of November, the Army commanded by General Washington, in person, was composed, nominally, of about twenty-five thousand, four hundred, and fifty men, of whom about twelve thousand and fifty were sick, on independent commands, or on furlough; leaving only about thirteen thousand, four hundred, rank and file, present and fit for duty.[9] The supply of Provisions, as the reader has been already informed,[10] was exceedingly scanty;[11] the Medicine-chest was almost destitute of both instruments and drugs;[12] and Clothing was a luxury in which very few could comfortably indulge themselves.[13] The troops, as we have already stated,[14] were dispirited and, often, disaffected;

"General McDougal's Brigade, of which the Maryland Regulars is "a part, having laid in the woods for three nights," [*preceding the day of the action on Chatterton's-hill, that is to say, on the nights of the twenty-fifth, twenty-sixth, and twenty-seventh of October,*] "two miles from this "place, and to the right of the main body, as a covering party, was or-"dered to advance along the road, about a mile, near a place called the "Mile-stone, and there take post, which was accordingly done." (*Letter to a Gentleman in Annapolis, dated* "WHITE-PLAINS, October 29, 1776," re-printed in Force's *American Archives*, V., ii., 1281.)

[1] "I am so closely confined to my post, on the left of the whole, as not "to have been a quarter mile West from this for four days past. Near "three thousand of the enemy, yesterday and the evening before, filed "off to the left, and were seen advancing towards King's street and the "Purchase road. . . . Our lines were manned all night, in con-"sequence of this; and a most horrid night it was to lay in cold "trenches. . . . I have only time to add that I am with usual "health, though in no better lodging than a soldier's tent, with our old "friend General Scott." (*General George Clinton to John McKesson*, "CAMP NEAR WHITE-PLAINS, October 31, 1776.")

[2] "On the same evening," [*October 23,*] "Col. Tyler's, Huntington's, and "Throop's Regiments, of General Parson's Brigade and of our General's "Division, moved, and took post at the head of King street, near Rye-"pond."—(*Memoirs of General Heath*, 75, 76.)

[3] Vide pages 251, ante.

[4] *General Heath to Colonel Lasher*, "WHITE PLAINS, October 27, 1776;". *General Greene to General Mifflin*, "FORT LEE, October 27, 1776;" *Memoirs of General Heath*, 79, 80.

[5] *General Greene to General Washington*, "FORT LEE, October 29, "1776."

[6] *Colonel Lasher to General Heath*, "CAMP AT KING'S BRIDGE, October "26, 1776."

[7] *Memoirs of General Heath*, 79, 80.

[8] *Colonel Lasher to General Heath*, "CAMP AT KING'S BRIDGE, October "26, 1776."

[9] *The General Returns of the Army*, dated on the third of November, six days after the action on Chatterton's-hill, showed an aggregate of twenty-five thousand, two hundred, and seventeen, "rank and file," including the Matrosses of ten Companies of Artillery and excluding, of course, the Commissioned Officers, the Staff, and the Non-commissioned Officers of the Army. Adding to these, those who had been killed and missing during the period which had intervened between the time of which we write and the date of the *Returns* referred to, in which occurred the action on Chatterton's-hill and all the other military operations in the vicinity of the White Plains; and it will be seen that, when the Army occupied the high grounds, to the northward of that Village, excluding the Sick, those who were on Commands, and those who were absent, on Furloughs, the effective force was only thirteen thousand, four hundred, and four, "rank and file."

[10] Vide pages 248, 250, ante.

[11] "His," [*General Washington's,*] "apprehensions are exceedingly "great lest the Army should suffer much for want of necessary supplies "of Provisions, especially in the article of Flour. From the best in-"telligence he is able to obtain, there is not more, in Camp and at "the several places where it has been deposited, than will serve the "Army longer than four or five days, provided the utmost care and "economy were used in issuing it out: but from the waste and em-"bezzlement, for want of proper attention to it, as is reported to him, "it is not probable that it will last so long"—(*Colonel Robert H. Harrison, Secretary of General Washington, to Colonel Joseph Trumbull, Commissary-general of Provisions* "WHITE-PLAINS, November 1, 1776.")

[12] "We want Medicine, much; none can be had, here. Our sick have" [*been*] "and are suffering extremely."—(*Colonel Smallwood to the Council of Safety of Maryland*, "PHILIPSE'S HEIGHTS, October, 1776.")

"I wrote a hasty letter, some time ago, requesting from the State "of New York, that they would allow me the remainder of the "stock of Medicines purchased for the use of the State, of which they "were so good as to allow me one-half, early in the Summer, for the "use of the Army. The demand for Medicines is very great; and we "cannot procure a sufficiency, at any rate."—(*Doctor John Morgan, Medical Director of the Army, to John Jay*, "NORTH-CASTLE, October 28, "1776.")

A letter from Doctor John Pine, of the Maryland Line, to James Tilghman, of Annapolis, dated, "CAMP AT WHITE-PLAINS, November 7, "1776," contains a detailed statement of the entire destitution of the Army, and of the consequent sufferings of the sick and wounded.

[13] "The Rebel Army are in so wretched a condition, as to Clothing and "Accoutrements, that I believe no Nation ever saw such a set of tatterde-"malions. There are few Coats among them but what are out at "elbows; and in a whole Regiment there is scarce a pair of Breeches. "Judge, then, how they must be pinched by a Winter Campaign."—(*Letter from an Officer of the Sixty fourth Regiment to his friend in London*, "NEW-YORK, October 30, 1776," re-printed in Force's *American Archives*, V., ii., 1293, 1294.)

"We are requested by the Generals of our State to inform you of the "absolute necessity our troops are in for want of Clothing."—(*Charles D. Witt, Robert Harper, and Lewis Graham to the President of the New York Convention*, "WHITE PLAINS, October 24, 1776.")

"The Colonel and Major Barber came here, last evening; and the "Regiment is now within a few miles of this place, marching with "cheerfulness; but great part of the men [*are*] barefooted and bare-legged." (*Richard Stockton to Abram Clark*, "SARATOGA, October 28 "1776.")

[14] Vide pages 223, 224, ante.

the term of service of very many of them had nearly expired;[1] and, very largely, that short term was made very much shorter by shameful desertions.[2] There was no harmony of sentiment, no common feeling of patriotism, no sympathy with each other as fellow-countrymen engaged in a common cause, in any portion of the Army. The Eastern troops were stigmatized as, generally, nothing else than a mass of speculating poltroons, for which, very often, there was abundant reason;[3] and they, reciprocated the ill-feeling of those from the Middle and Southern States, by branding them as "Aristocrats" and "Maccaronis"—the former of the two sobriquets in allusion to the distinctions of rank which were maintained among those troops, so different from the practice of the New Englanders; the latter, in contemptuous reference to the Regiments, from the Middle and Southern States, who were uniformed, well-equipped, and properly disciplined[4]—adding fuel to the flames of discord, which, on more than one occasion, required all the good judgment and determination of which the Commander-in-chief was master, to prevent a serious outbreak.[5]

It will be remembered that, on Monday, the twenty-first of October, the Right and Centre of the Royal Army were moved to a position, on the road leading to the White Plains, about two miles to the northward of New Rochelle; and that Lieutenant-general Heister, with the Left of the Army, consisting of one Brigade of British and two Brigades of Hessian troops, moved forward and occupied the position which had been thus abandoned.[6] It will be remembered, also, that, on the same day, Lieutenant-colonel Rogers, with the Corps of Loyalists known as "The Queen's "Rangers," was detached from the main body of the Army, and pushed forward to take possession of Mamaroneck,[7] where, on the following night, he and his command "were roughly handled," by a party of Americans who had been despatched from the White Plains, for that purpose;[8] which led General Howe, on the following day, [*Tuesday, October* 22,] to move the Sixth Brigade of British troops, commanded by Brigadier-general Agnew, to sustain that important post.[9] It will be remembered, also, that, on Sunday, the twentieth of October, the Royal Army was strengthened by the addition of a portion of the Sixteenth and the whole of the Seventeenth Regiments of Light Dragoons, the former commanded by Lieutenant-colonel Harcourt, an Officer of great merit;[10] and that, on Tuesday, the twenty-second of October, it was further strengthened by the arrival, at New Rochelle, of Lieutenant-general Knyphausen, with the Second Division of Hessians and the Regiment of Waldeckers.[11]

Taking counsel of his experience, General Howe ordered Lieutenant-general Heister, with the Left of the Army, to join in the movement; and, on Thursday, the twenty-fourth, and on Friday, the twenty-fifth, of October, the main body of the Royal Army was moved from the positions on which it had rested, for several days, towards Scarsdale.[12] It moved in two

---

[1] Many of the troops were enlisted to serve only until the first of December; and the terms of service of the greater portion of the remainder would expire on the last day of December, ensuing.—(*General Washington to the President of the Congress*, "HEAD-QUARTERS, AT COLONEL "MORRIS'S HOUSE, 18 September, 1776;" etc.)

[2] *General Washington to the Officers and Soldiers of the Pennsylvania Association*, "HEAD-QUARTERS, NEW-YORK, 8 August, 1776;" *the same to the President of the Congress*, "NEW-YORK, 2 September, 1776;" *General Schuyler to General Gates*, "SARATOGA, October 30, 1776;" etc.

[3] The following is a specimen of a multitude of such testimonials of the speculative propensities of the New England troops, in the Army of the Revolution, and of their too frequent dishonesty in their operations, which are accessible to every one. Every careful student can command many such evidences; but this, written by the Commissary-general of Provisions of the Continental Army, himself a Connecticut-man, to his father, Jonathan Trumbull, who was, then, the Governor of Connecticut, will be sufficient, for the purposes under consideration.

"NORTH-CASTLE, 4th December, 1776.

"HONOURED SIR:

"Enclosed I send you Returns of some of the Regiments of Con-"necticut Militia under command of Major General Wooster, such as "I can get; though I have called and called again and again for them, "I believe there are but one of them really true, that is Major Brins-"made's, who seems to be the honestest man. The fact is, they can't "make their Weekly and Provision Returns agree; for this reason, "they have made a number of Brevet Officers. They doubt whether "these Officers will be allowed extra rations: to avoid that, they re-"turn so many more men as to cover the extra rations of those Offi-"cers. You'll see by adverting to the Returns, that some Companies "have more Officers than Privates, at best; but not content with that, "and instead of sending home the Officers who have very few men, "almost none, and turning over those few men into other Companies, "they add Brevet Officers, not only to pick the pockets of the pub-"lick, here, but also, those Brevet Officers are to be dismissed from "the Militia Rolls, at home; and, in a few times more being called "forth, there will be no Militia left in the State.

"These things I thought it my duty to report to you, as the char-"acter of the State is at stake; and how the Officers who have done "these things will get along, here, I don't know, as we now make "Weekly Ration Returns as well as Returns of the Army, by which "they must be discovered. The consequence is bad to the Officers; how-"ever, they must take their fate.

"I am sorry to have the character of the State suffer by such conduct "of its Officers.

* * * * * * * * *

"I am, honoured Sir, your dutiful Son,

"JOS. TRUMBULL.

"Governour TRUMBULL."

We have seen no evidence that either General Wooster or Commissary-general Trumbull took any steps for either the arrest of the offenders or a suppression of the offences.

[4] Reed's *Life of Joseph Reed*, i., 239-242; Gordon's *History of the American Revolution*, ii., 304, 311, 321, 331, 333-335; Marshall's *Life of George Washington*, ii., 473, 474; etc.

[5] *General Orders*, "NEW-YORK August 1, 1776;" Gordon's *History of the American Revolution*, ii., 341; etc.

[6] Vide page 249, ante.

See, also, *General Howe to Lord George Germain*, "NEW-YORK, 30th "November, 1776;" [Hall's] *History of the Civil War in America*, i., 205; etc.

[7] Vide page 249, ante.

[8] Vide pages 252, 253, ante.

[9] Vide page 253, ante.

[10] Vide page 249, ante.

[11] Vide page 253, ante.

[12] Information was received, at the White Plains, as early as two o'clock on Thursday afternoon, [*October* 24,] that the Royal Army had struck its tents, on its position near New Rochelle, "early this morning;" and that it was, then, "advancing from that to this place, along the common "road."—(*General George Clinton to John McKesson, Secretary to the New-York Convention*, "WHITE-PLAINS, October 24, 2 P. M., 1776.")

columns, with great caution;[1] and, on the twenty-fifth of October, when the heads of the columns reached Scarsdale, after their two days' march, they were halted; and the Army encamped in a line which was parallel with the Bronx-river and with the line of march, on the opposite side of that little stream, on which General Lee, with his heavily laden column, was transporting the Baggage and Stores of the American Army, to the White Plains[2]—in many places, the two were not more than a mile distant from each other; and, in one place, if not in others, the toiling Americans were directly within sight of their powerful enemy.

The object of General Howe, in halting at Scarsdale, with his Right within four miles of the American lines, at the White Plains, and of remaining encamped at that place, without making a movement, of any kind, during nearly three days, was not understood by those, in Europe, who were inclined to condemn his conduct, as Commander-in-chief of the Army, before the Parliament and the country; and the evidently studied silence, on that subject, which the General maintained, was not calculated to quiet, nor even to lessen, the fault-findings of those who were his political and personal enemies. But, whatever may have been thought and said of his failure to cross the Bronx and to attack the heavily laden column commanded by General Lee, the maxims of military science, at that time, forbade a movement towards the White Plains, then, leaving his left flank and his rear exposed to the three Divisions commanded, respectively, by Generals Lee, Spencer, and Lincoln.[3] There was a possibility that the separation of those three Divisions from the main body of the Army might have enabled him to attack the Americans, *en detail*, and to overcome them more completely than if they had been in one body; but he had excellent evidence of the vigilance and the enterprise of those who were nearest to him; and his ruling principle, to avoid an unnecessary exposure of his men, evidently led him to the safe conclusion that, in such a series of undertakings on the divided forces of the Americans, if more than one attack on them were to be made, the last one of the series should be that on that portion of the American Army which, then, occupied the entrenched Camp, at the White Plains, a conclusion in which he would have been entirely sustained by every intelligent soldier, of that period, in Europe or in America.

Notwithstanding the silence of General Howe, concerning his purpose in moving his command to Scarsdale, instead of to the White Plains, there is reason for supposing that it was done for the purpose of cutting off the column commanded by General Lee, before it could join the main body; that preparations for the movement, on the following morning, were made on the afternoon and evening of the day of the arrival of the Royal Army, at Scarsdale; and that it was prevented by the withdrawal of the column which it was intended to attack, from its designated route, into a road which was further westward, so that, when the time came for the attack, General Lee, by a forced march, during the night, was several miles nearer to the main body of the Army, and entirely beyond the reach of General Howe.[4]

In his letter to the President of the Congress, dated "HEAD-QUARTERS, "WHITE-PLAINS, 25 October, 1776," Colonel Robert H. Harrison, General Washington's Secretary, stated that "about two o'clock this afternoon, "intelligence was brought to Head-quarters, that three or four detach-"ments of the enemy were on their march, and had advanced within "about four miles of this place. It has been fully confirmed, since, by "a variety of persons, who have been out to reconnoitre."

If General Clinton did not make a mistake in the date of his letter, of which we have no evidence, the movement of the Royal Army was commenced on Thursday, [*October* 24;] and the letter of Colonel Harrison clearly indicated that it had already reached Scarsdale, within four miles of the Plains, before the movement was known at Head-quarters, at two o'clock in the afternoon of the following day. [*Friday, October* 25.]

The failure of General Washington to obtain information of the movements of the King's troops, of which so many instances have been seen, was nowhere more evident than in the instance now under consideration—one of the reasonable results of the outrages to which the inhabitants had been subjected, by both the Congresses and the Committees, on the one hand, and by the unrestrained thieves, among both the Officers and the Privates of the Army whom General Washington commanded, on the other.

[1] "General Howe thought it necessary to proceed with great circum-"spection. The progress was slow; the march of the Army, close; the "encampments, compact and well guarded with artillery; and the most "soldier-like caution used, in every respect."—(*Annual Register for* 1776; History of Europe, 177.)

"The British continued moving up, but with great caution, their rear "scarcely advancing, when they came to encamp again, much further "than where the advance had moved from."—(*Memoirs of Major-general Heath*, 76.)

"The caution of the English General was increased by the evidences "of enterprise in his adversary. His object seems to have been to avoid "skirmishing, and to bring on a general action, if that could be effected "under favorable circumstances; if not, he knew well the approaching "dissolution of the American Army, and calculated, not without reason, "to derive from that event nearly all the advantages of a victory. He "proceeded, therefore, slowly. His marches were in close order; his "encampments compact, and well guarded with artillery; and the ut-"most circumspection was used, not to expose any part which might be "vulnerable."—(Marshall's *Life of George Washington*, ii., 501.)

[2] *General Howe to Lord George Germaine*, "NEW-YORK, 30 November, "1776;" Sauthier's *Plan of the Operations*, etc.; Gordon's *History of the American Revolution*, ii., 340; etc.

[3] Other instances of that peculiar caution were seen, at the White Plains, three days after the instance now under notice, when the main body of the Army was halted, until the Americans had been driven from Chatterton's-hill, and, most disastrously to the Americans, in the following year, when the fruits of the victory, at Germantown, were lost by the halt of the main body, in order to dislodge a handful of the Royal Army who had occupied and who held the Chew mansion.

[4] In a letter which was written by an Officer of the Royal Army, dated on the tenth of November, and printed in *The Middlesex Journal and Evening Advertiser*, No. 1209, LONDON: From Saturday, December 21, to Tuesday, December 24, 1776, will be found our authority for what we have said of the purposes of General Howe, of his preparations for carrying out those purposes, and of the cause of his disappointment; and a reference to the letter of Colonel Glover, with which our readers are already familiar, ("MILES-SQUARE, October 22, 1776,") there is an ample confirmation of each of the statements—the Colonel erroneously stated that the Royal Army was moved from New Rochelle, on Sunday, the twenty-seventh of October, instead of on Friday, the twenty-fifth of that month, and so continued to be two days too late, in each of his subsequent statements; but, in all else, his statements of the movement of General Howe, of the discovery, by General Lee, of the purpose to cut him off from the main body of the Army; of the consequent *detour* of the column, into the Dobbs's-ferry road; of its forced night-march; and of

At length, all the necessary preparations having been completed, early in the morning of Monday, the twenty-eighth of October, the Royal Army struck its tents, in the encampment, at Scarsdale, which it had occupied since the preceding Friday; and, in two columns, right in front, it moved towards the White Plains.[1] The right column, which was composed mostly of British troops, was commanded by Lieutenant-general Sir Henry Clinton;[2] the left column, with whom was General Howe,[3] was composed mostly of German troops, and was commanded by Lieutenant-general Heister.[4]

The American pickets were driven in, by the Light Infantry, of the right column, and by the Chasseurs, of the left column;[5] and when the moving columns reached Hart's-corners—now known by the name of Hartsdale—they encountered a body of New England troops, composed of a "part of General Wadsworth's "Brigade, with some other Regiments,"[6] the whole under the command of Major-general Spencer,[7] and numbering not far from twenty-six hundred Officers and effective men,[8] whom General Washington had sent out, to hold the enemy in check. These were posted, advantageously, "on the old York road," it is said;[9] and it is also said that when the left column of the Royal Army "had advanced within musket-shot "of our troops, a full discharge of musketry warned "them of their danger. At first, they," [*the Hessians,*] "fell back; but, rallying again, immediately, and the" [*right*] "column of British troops having advanced "upon our" [*General Spencer's*] "left, it became necessary" [*for him*] "to retire;"[10] taking the opportunity, "occasionally," to form behind the stone walls, on the line of his retreat, and to annoy those who pursued him[11]—it has been said, however, that the flight of that large detachment was hastened by the appearance, on its front, of the British Light Dragoons;[12] and that the retreat was not such an one as reflected credit on its discipline, as soldiers, or on its bravery, as men.[13] A large portion, if not the whole, of the detachment, terror-stricken and without any appearance of order, sought "the ford"—a shallow portion of the Bronx-river, apparently a short distance below the present railroad-bridge, between Hartsdale and the White Plains—closely pursued by Colonel Rall, with the Brigade, composed of the Regiments of Lossberg, Knyphausen, and Rall, whom he commanded;[14] and, having passed the little stream, the cowardly fugitives found refuge in the neighboring

its arrival at the White Plains, at ten o'clock on the following morning, were in entire harmony with what was stated by the British Officer, through *The Middlesex Journal.*

[1] *General Howe to Lord George Germaine,* "NEW-YORK, 30 November, "1776;" [Hall's] *History of the Civil War in America,* i., 207; Stedman's *History of the American War,* i., 212; Gordon's *History of the American Revolution,* ii., 340; Marshall's *Life of George Washington,* ii., 503; etc.

[2] Sauthier's *Plan of the Operations,* etc.; Stedman's *History of the American War,* i., 212; etc.

[3] Stedman's *History of the American War,* i., 212; Marshall's *Life of George Washington,* ii., 503; etc.

[4] *General Howe to Lord George Germaine,* "NEW-YORK, 30 November, "1776;" Sauthier's *Plan of the Operations,* etc.; Gordon's *History of the American Revolution,* ii., 340; etc.

Very singularly, Marshall, (*Life of George Washington,* ii., 503,) stated that the left column was commanded by Lieutenant-general Knyphausen, who had not left the Second Division of German troops, whom he commanded, which was, then, at New Rochelle.

[5] *General Howe to Lord George Germaine,* "NEW-YORK, 30 November, "1776;" [Hall's] *History of the Civil War in America,* i., 207; Stedman's *History of the American War,* i., 212; Marshall's *Life of George Washington,* ii., 503; etc.

[6] *Extract of a letter from a Gentleman in the Army, dated* "CAMP NEAR "THE MILLS, ABOUT THREE MILES NORTH OF WHITE-PLAINS, November "1, 1776," re-printed in Force's *American Archives,* "V. iii., 473, 474.

We have learned from the *Returns of the Killed, Wounded, and Missing,* on that day, of Regiments who are known to have taken no part whatever in the subsequent action on Chatterton's-hill, of what Regiments that force who met the King's troops, near Hart's-corners, was composed: it contained the Regiments commanded by Colonels Silliman, Selden, Sage and Douglass—the latter commanded by Lieutenant-colonel Arnold—all of them of the Brigade commanded by General Wadsworth; the Regiment commanded by Colonel Chester, of the Brigade commanded by Colonel Sargent; the Regiments commanded by Colonels Baldwin, Douglass, and Lieutenant-colonel Ely, of the Brigade commanded by General Suttonstall; and the Regiments commanded by Colonels Holman and Smith, of the Brigade commanded by General Fellows. All these made *Returns of Casualties* sustained by them, on that occasion; how many other Regiments there were, whose bashfulness forbade the making of any Returns, we have not ascertained.

[7] *Letter from a Gentleman in the Army,* "CAMP NEAR THE MILLS, ABOUT "THREE MILES NORTH OF WHITE-PLAINS, November 1, 1776;" *Memoir of Colonel Benjamin Tallmadge,* prepared by himself, at the request of his children, 13; etc.

[8] We are not insensible of the fact that "a Gentleman in the Army," from whose letter, dated "CAMP NEAR THE MILLS, ABOUT THREE MILES "NORTH OF WHITE-PLAINS, November 1, 1776," we have already made extracts, stated that the command of General Spencer, on the occasion under notice, "consisted, in the whole of five or six hundred men;" but, on the third of November, five days after the engagement, the same Regiments reported an aggregate strength of four thousand, seven hundred, and ninety-six, of whom five hundred and sixty Officers, non-commissioned Officers, and Musicians, and two thousand and seventy-six Privates "fit for duty," were present. (*General Return of the Army in the service of the United States,* November 3, 1776.) We have determined, therefore, that the effective strength of the Regiments, on the occasion under notice, before they were met by the enemy, was not far from twenty-six hundred men, as we have said in the text.

Lieutenant-colonel Tench Tilghman, one of the Aides of General Washington, in a letter to his father, dated "WHITE-PLAINS, 31st Octo-"ber, 1776," said, "On Monday morning we rec'd Information that the "Enemy were in Motion and in March towards our Lines, all our Men "were immediately at their Alarm Posts and about 2000 detached to give "the Enemy as much annoyance as possible on their approach;" and Brigade-major Tallmadge, of the Brigade commanded by General Wadsworth, himself present and a participant in the affair, stated, (*Memoir of Colonel Benjamin Tallmadge, prepared by himself,* 13,) that it was "a detachment of 2000 or 3000 men," both of which statements, from those who were entirely competent to make them with accuracy, go far to confirm what we have more definitely stated in the text.

[9] *Memoir of Colonel Benjamin Tallmadge,* prepared by himself, 13.

[10] *The same,* 13, 14.

[11] *The same,* 14.

[12] Gordon's *History of the American Revolution,* ii., 340, 341, 342.

[13] Brigade-major Tallmadge's description of the retreat, leaves no room for questioning the accuracy of our statement, in the text.

[14] It was that Brigade, commanded by the same Colonel, Rall, who was captured at Trenton, in the following December; and we have ascertained the Regiments of whom it was composed, from the despatch of General Howe to Lord George Germaine, dated "NEW-YORK, December "29, 1776," announcing that disaster to the Royal Army, to the Home Government.

In the despatch of General Washington to the Congress, dated "HEAD-"QUARTERS, NEWTOWN, 27th December, 1776," the Regiment of Lossberg is called the Regiment of Landspatch. We have preferred to follow General Howe, as our authority, in this instance.

hills of Greenburgh,[1] and were reported among the "Missing," which, in that Army, too often, afforded a resting-place for the name and the fame of a coward and poltroon.[2] In the instances now under consideration, many of these bashful New Englanders purged themselves of some portion of the reproach produced by their cowardice, by returning, as they found opportunities, in small parties, to the Camp, at the White Plains,[3] exemplifying the truth of the old couplet:

"He who fights and runs away,
"Will live to fight, another day;"

while their Hessian pursuers, probably checked in their further progress by their discovery of the troops on Chatterton's-hill, of whom the reader will learn more, hereafter, occupied a position on the high ground, westward from the Harlem Railroad, between Chatterton's-hill and the present railroad-station, at Hartsdale.[4]

An amusing incident connected with that disgraceful retreat of General Spencer's command, was related by Major Benjamin Tallmadge, then Brigade-major of General Wadsworth's Brigade and, himself, one of the fugitives—subsequently better known in connection with the detention of Major André. After having described the retreat of the detachment of Americans and the pursuit by the Brigade of Hessians, the rush of the former for the ford and the anxiety of the fugitives to pass the river, he said, "They," [*the Americans,*] "immediately entered the river and ascended "the hill; while I, being in the rear and mounted on "horseback, endeavored to hasten the last of our "troops, the Hessians being then within musket-"shot. When I reached the bank of the river, and "was about to enter it, our Chaplain, the Rev. Dr. "Trumbull, sprang up, behind me, on my horse, with "such force as to carry me, with my accoutrements, "together with himself, headlong into the river. This "so disconcerted me, that, by the time I reached the "opposite bank of the river, the Hessian troops were "about to enter it, and considered me their prisoner," in which, however, they reckoned without their host, since he watched for an opportunity, and escaped, by way of what have been more recently known as "the Mill-lane" and the road to Dobbs's-ferry, conveying to General Washington, at Head-quarters, information of the situation of the troops, on the opposite bank of the river.[5]

On the left of the line of march of the Royal Army and on the western bank of the Bronx-river, which flowed through a marshy valley of some extent, at its base, arose the bold and rocky height which was known, then, and is still known, as "Chatterton's-hill." It is one of the range of high grounds, on the western side of the Bronx, on which the line of entrenched encampments had been thrown up by detachments from the American Army, the latter then occupying the Heights of Harlem, for the purpose of preventing the enemy from crossing the Bronx and closing the line of communication between the Army and the country—the same line of defensive works, indeed, which subsequently covered the retreat of the Army, from Harlem Heights to the White Plains—and it extended, northwardly, to within a short distance from the American lines—the latter on the opposite side of the little stream and of the marshy intervale—and really, to some extent, it commanded the right and centre of them.[6] It had been occupied, and an earthwork of small pretensions had been thrown up, on it, probably by the Regiment of Massachusetts Militia, commanded by Colonel John Brooks, then of General Lincoln's Division and subsequently Governor of Massachusetts;[7] and, on the morning of Monday, the

[1] Indeed, they were among those hills as soon as they had passed the Bronx, at the ford; and, there, they found safety, for a few days, as we shall see, hereafter.

Irving facetiously remarked, (*Life of George Washington*, ii., 393,) they "scattered themselves among the hills, but afterwards returned to "Head-quarters."

[2] It is amusing to see Connecticut-men claim that *these* poltroons were those who fought the Battle and defended Chatterton's hill, without alluding to any other troops, unless without giving them credit for having done anything worthy of notice. (*Letter from a Gentleman in the Army*, "CAMP NEAR THE MILLS, ABOUT THREE MILES NORTH FROM THE "WHITE PLAINS, November 1, 1776;" Hitchcock's *Historical Collection, of the part taken by Connecticut, during the War of the Revolution*, 93; etc.

[3] Gordon's *History of the American Revolution*, ii., 343; etc.

[4] *General Howe to Lord George Germaine*, "NEW-YORK, 30 November, "1776;" Sauthier's *Plan of the Operations*, etc.; [Hall's] *History of the Civil War in America*, i., 208; Gordon's *History of the American Revolution*, ii., 340; etc.

[5] *Memoir of Colonel Benjamin Tallmadge*, prepared by himself, 14.

[6] Our personal knowledge of the ground is our authority for this description of it.

Stedman, in his *History of the American War*, (i., 214,) attempted to qualify that fact—"it rose so gradually from the Bronx," he said, "that "its crest was not within random cannon-shot, as was proved by many "of our Battalions lying upon it, on their arms, the whole evening after "the action;"—but, nevertheless, those who know the entire ground, composing Chatterton's-hill and its dependencies, will fully sustain us, in what we have said, in the text, on that subject.

[7] Because a portion of General Lincoln's Division, with all of that of General Spencer, had been detached from the main body of the Army, and sent forward, with orders to occupy all the high grounds, between Valentine's-hill and the White Plains, and to strengthen them with entrenchments; and because the Regiment commanded by Colonel Brooks formed a portion of one of the Divisions who were thus detailed to occupy and to strengthen those high grounds; and because we have not found the slightest allusion to the Regiment commanded by Colonel Brooks, in any of the descriptions of the movements of troops, at any time previous to the attack on Chatterton's-hill, by the Royal troops: and because we cannot find any Order, from Head-quarters, for any other occupation of Chatterton's-hill, until the morning of the twenty-eighth of October, when Colonel Haslet, with his well-tried command, was ordered by General Washington "to take possession of the hill beyond our lines "and the command of the Militia Regiment there posted," (*Colonel Haslet to General Rodney*, "November 12, 1776,") when a Regiment of Militia, whose subsequent conduct clearly identified it as that commanded by Colonel Brooks, was found in possession of the ground—all these reasons lead us to the conclusion stated in the text.

We are not insensible that words employed by Colonel Harrison, in his letter to the President of the Congress, dated "WHITE-PLAINS, 29 "October, 1776," have been construed to mean that troops had been sent down, on the morning of the twenty-eighth of October, "with a view of "throwing up some lines," on Chatterton's-hill; and that the biographer of Colonel Rufus Putnam, (*Memoir of Colonel Rufus Putnam*, in Hildreth's *Biographical and Historical Memoirs of the Early Settlers of Ohio*,

twenty-eighth of October, General Washington ordered Colonel Haslet, with his Regiment of Delaware troops, and General McDougal, with his Brigade, the latter composed of the Regiment of New York troops whom he had formerly commanded, the Regiment of the same Line who was commanded by Colonel Ritzema, the Regiment of Maryland troops whom Colonel Smallwood commanded, and the Regiment of Connecticut troops commanded by Colonel Charles Webb, to occupy the same position.[1]

It appears that Colonel Haslet's command was the first of the reinforcements to reach the hill;[2] and it is very probable that it was either that Regiment or that commanded by Colonel Brooks or both, together, on the summit of the high ground, on his right, which led Colonel Rall to check his Hessian Regiments, in their pursuit of the fugitive New Englanders, and to occupy the position on the high ground, nearer to Hartsdale, to which reference has been made, whence he could move, if such a movement should become expedient, on the right flank and rear of whatever force of the Americans should occupy Chatterton's-hill—a movement, by the way, since it was evidently made by Colonel Rall, on his own impulse, which reflected great credit on the military abilities of that subsequently unfortunate Officer.[3]

While Colonel Rall was thus engaged, on the left of the enemy's line of march, the two columns continued their movements toward the American lines, "as if they meant to attack us, there," as General Washington's Secretary subsequently described the movement[4]—indeed, General Howe subsequently stated that "an assault upon the enemy's "right, which was opposed to the Hessian troops, "was intended."[5] The Army was formed, evidently, for a general movement on the right and center of the American lines, with its right resting on the road which led from the White Plains to Mamaroneck, about a mile from the center of the former, and its Left on the Bronx-river, about the same distance from the extreme right of the American entrenchments;[6] and what appeared to have been the decisive hour in which the future of America was to be determined, by the arbitrament of arms, had, at length, been reached. But the bright designs of God, concerning America, were widely different from those of men; the future of those thirteen new-born members of the community of nations, in His purposes, was not dependent on the result of an assault on the improvised lines of defense, on the high grounds, in the vicinity of the White Plains; and the powerful arm which was already uplifted and ready to strike a crushing blow on that which God had predestinated for other ends, was restrained by an unseen power, a power before which the King of Great Britain and all his Armies were as nothing, by the same power which had restrained the same arm, uplifted, at Gravesend and before Brooklyn, at Kip's-bay and on Throgg's-neck—the handful of American troops, on the summit of Chatterton's-hill, a phantom which seemed to augur ill for the left flank and rear of the Royal Army, was seen by General Howe; the further advance of the main body, toward the American lines, was stayed; the uplifted arm fell, without having struck the blow which was intended; the right and center of the American line remained, unharmed; and another opportunity for the determination of the great dispute, between Great Britain and America, was lost, never to be be regained.

64,) has stated that, on that morning, that Engineer had been ordered to that hill, to superintend the construction of some more important entrenchments. But there is nothing inconsistent with either of these statements, if not distorted, in what we have written concerning the probable pre-occupation of Chatterton's-hill by the Regiment of Massachusetts Militia commanded by Colonel John Brooks.

It is very evident that whatever defensive works there may have been on the hill, at the time of the engagement, if there were any, they afforded no shelter for the men.—(*Lieutenant-colonel Tilghman to William Lee*, "HEAD-QUARTERS, WHITE-PLAINS, October 29, 1776.")

See, also, *Lieutenant colonel Tilghman to his father*, "WHITE-PLAINS, 31 "October, 1776."

[1] *Colonel Haslet to General Cæsar Rodney*, "November 12, 1776;" *Extracts of the Brigade commanded by General McDougal*, November 3, 1776; etc.

[2] *Colonel Haslet to General Cæsar Rodney*, "November 12, 1776."

As the Delaware Regiment commanded by Colonel Haslet, was of the Brigade commanded by General Lord Stirling, and was ordered by General Washington "to take possession of the hill and the command of "the Militia Regiment there posted; which was done," of which there has been no question; and since the Brigade which was commanded by General McDougal subsequently moved up the same hill, which no one has ever pretended to deny, it is not evident why Colonel Carrington, (*Battles of the American Revolution*, 240,) without the slightest authority to sustain him, made a special attempt to belittle Colonel Haslet, individually, and as an Officer—he could not belittle his doings nor those of his command, on that field—because, in his Report of the action, to General Rodney—the only Report from an actual participant in the affair, which has come down to us—he described, in detail, his own and his gallant Regiment's portions of the doings on that historically important occasion.

[3] "Colonel Rall . . . took possession of it, with great alacrity, to "the approbation of Lieutenant-general Heister, who was acquainted with "this movement by Sir William Erskine," the Quartermaster-general of the British Army.—(*General Howe to Lord George Germaine*, "NEW-YORK, "30 November, 1776.")

It will be seen, from that paragraph, that the action of Colonel Rall, in thus occupying a position on the right flank of the Americans who were occupying Chatterton's-hill, received the favorable notices of both the British and the German Generals, commanding: we shall see, hereafter, how important that action was, in the subsequent engagement.

[4] *Colonel Robert H. Harrison to the President of the Congress*, "WHITE-"PLAINS, 29 October, 1776."

[5] *Speech of General Howe before a Committee of the House of Commons*, April 29, 1779—Almon's *Parliamentary Register*, Fifth Session, Fourteenth Parliament, xii., 324; *Narrative of Lieutenant-general Sir William Howe*, 6.

[6] *General Howe to Lord George Germaine*, "NEW-YORK, 30th Novem-"ber, 1776;" Sauthier's *Plan of the Operations*, etc.; Gordon's *History of the American Revolution*, ii., 310; etc.

Stedman stated, (*History of the American War*, i., 214,) that "the "Right wing of the British did not extend beyond the center of the "American Army," which is in harmony with what General Howe had stated concerning the distance of his Right from the American lines—he referred to the center, without having made the slightest allusion to the left, where General Heath was posted. Stedman continued: "That "part of the enemy's position," [*the American center*,] "did not seem to "be considered: all the attention of the British Commander being fixed "on another part of the field"—as we have already seen, "an assault "upon the American right, which was opposed to the Hessian troops, "was intended;" and the British troops were to have been spared, for other services, elsewhere.

The force, on the summit of Chatterton's-hill, which had thus, insensibly, arrested the progress of the Royal Army, in its movement against the Right and Center of the American lines, was, of course, that of whom we have already made mention—the Regiments commanded, respectively, by Colonels Brooks and Haslet, the Brigade commanded by General McDougal not having reached the hill; and against that small force, the Hessian Artillery, from the Plain, on the opposite side of the Bronx, not far from the present railroad-station, at the White Plains, opened a vigorous fire,[1] with no other effect, however, than the wounding of one of the Militia, which so greatly alarmed his comrades that the entire Regiment "broke, and fled, and were not rallied, without much "difficulty."[2] Soon after the cannonade was commenced, General McDougal and his command reached the hill-top; and the command of the entire force devolved on and was assumed by that very inexperienced Officer. After several changes, in the positions of the several Regiments, the line was formed, with the Regiment of Massachusetts Militia, commanded by Colonel Brooks, sheltered by a stone wall, and supported by the Regiment of Marylanders commanded by Colonel Smallwood—the latter, the remains of that fine body of "Maccaronies," so called by the New Englanders, whose gallant conduct, at the Battle of Long Island, had won the admiration and sorrow of General Washington, and which has been generally honored in history—on the extreme right, confronting Colonel Rall and his Brigade, who were resting on their arms, on the summit of the adjacent hill, further to the southward. On the left of the Marylanders, was posted the Delaware Regiment, proud of its name of "The Blue Hen's Chickens," whom Colonel Haslet commanded: the remainder of General McDougal's Brigade, composed of the First Regiment of the New York Line, formerly commanded by Colonel McDougal, at that time, by one of its Captains, whose name was not recorded; the Third Regiment of the same Line, commanded by Colonel Rudolphus Ritzema; and the Regiment of the Connecticut Line, commanded by Colonel Charles Webb, occupying the left of the very feeble line[3]—with the exception of the Regiment commanded by Colonel Brooks, no portion of that force was composed of Militia: all, except that Regiment, were Continental troops.[4] The Company of New-York Artillery, with two small field-pieces, commanded by Captain Alexander Hamilton and forming a portion of the Brigade commanded by General McDougal, was, also, present; but history has not recorded the name of the Officer who, then, commanded it.[5]

The cannonade of the little party, on Chatterton's-hill, was continued by the Hessian Artillerists, without cessation, while the General Officers, it is said,[6] assembled in Council, without having dismounted; and it is probable that the noisy demonstration, so very characteristic of Germans, in their use of gunpowder, was continued, with unabated ardor, until the movement of their companions in arms, up the steep and rugged hill-side, of which the reader will learn more, hereafter, obliged the gunners to suspend their operations.[7]

"Upon viewing the situation," in deference to the

---

[1] *Lieutenant-colonel Tilghman to William Duer*, "HEAD-QUARTERS, "WHITE-PLAINS, October 29, 1776;" *the same to his father*, "WHITE-"PLAINS, 31 October, 1776;" *Colonel Robert H. Harrison to Governor Trumbull*, "WHITE-PLAINS, November 2, 1776;" *Colonel Haslet to General Cæsar Rodney*, "WHITE-PLAINS, November 12, 1776"; etc.

[2] *Colonel Haslet to General Cæsar Rodney*, "November 12, 1776."

[3] *Colonel Haslet to General Cæsar Rodney*, "November 12, 1776;" Captain Hull's unpublished *Memoir of his Revolutionary Services*, quoted in Campbell's *Revolutionary Services and Civil Life of General William Hull*, by his daughter, 54, 55; etc.

[4] Colonel Carrington, (*Battles of the American Revolution*, 240,) was at some pains to introduce Colonel Morris Graham, of the New York Militia, and to place his name where it would appear among those of Colonels commanding Regiments who had occupied and defended Chatterton's-hill; but no other writer than he has thus honored Colonel Graham, himself unworthy of any such authorial favor; and, besides, Colonel Carrington could have easily ascertained that Colonel Graham's command was a portion of the Brigade commanded by General George Clinton, who was posted on the extreme left of the American line, not far from two miles from Chatterton's-hill.

No one has pretended that the Adjutant-general of the Army was on Chatterton's-hill, on that eventful Monday; but he must have been there, if Colonel Carrington is correct, since it was he who accused Colonel Graham of cowardice, on which Colonel Carrington has based his favor to the bashful New-Yorker.

[5] It is a notable fact that, notwithstanding all which has been written, in those latter days, of the great services of that Company, of which contemporary writers were entirely silent, the name of the Officer who was in actual command, on Chatterton's-hill, was not mentioned by any one, of that period, who wrote concerning the Battle.

There is a tradition that, a short time before the date under consideration, Captain Hamilton was in the City of New-York, then in possession of the King's Army; and there is, certainly, written evidence, over his own signature, that he was in the same City, on the sixth of November, eight days after the Battle: it is possible, therefore, that, because the command was not in the official commander, on the occasion under consideration, the name of the actual commander was not regarded as worthy of being recorded.

[6] "I saw their General Officers, on horseback, assemble in Council." —(*Colonel Haslet to General Cæsar Rodney*, "November 12, 1776.")

[7] There is, evidently, considerable exaggeration in what was written of that cannonade, by "a Gentleman in the Army," in his letter, already resorted to, dated "CAMP NEAR THE MILLS, ABOUT THREE MILES NORTH "OF THE WHITE PLAINS, November 1, 1776;" but we make room for it. "The scene was grand and solemn; all the adjacent hills smoked, as "though on fire, and bellowed and trembled with a perpetual cannonade "and fire of field pieces, howitz, and mortars. The air groaned "with streams of cannon and musket-shot; the air and hills smoked and "echoed, terribly, with the bursting of shells; the fences and walls were "knocked down, and torn to pieces; and men's legs, arms, and bodies "mingled with cannon and grape-shot, all round us. I was in the ac-"tion, and under as good advantages as any one man, to observe all that "passed, and write these particulars of the action from my own observa-"tion."

A very near connection, by marriage, of our own family, then living where what was, lately, Hall's Tavern, at Hall's-corners, now known as Elmsford, on the road leading from the White Plains to Tarrytown, told us, many years ago, that he heard that severe cannonade, and saw the smoke occasioned by it, and very clearly remembered it: and, as may be reasonably supposed, under such circumstances, he regarded it as something more than ordinarily terrible.

What we have said concerning the extent of time thus occupied by the Hessian Artillerists, in their cannonade of the Americans, was authorized by Colonel Haslet, in his letter to General Rodney, already referred to; by Campbell's *Revolutionary Services and Civil Life of General William Hull*, 54; etc.

standard military maxim, of that period, which required the immediate removal of everything which might, possibly, endanger a flank or the rear of a column, no matter how insignificant it might otherwise be; and, undoubtedly, with the concurrence of the impromptu Council, of which mention has been made, General Howe determined to dislodge the Americans who had occupied Chatterton's-hill, before he proceeded further, in his movement against the main body of the American Army, then within its line of entrenchments, and awaiting his evidently intended assault. With that purpose in view, the main body of the Royal Army was ordered to rest on its arms, on the Plain, within a mile, and in open sight, from the American lines; orders were issued for a Battalion of Hessians to pass over the Bronx-river,[1] supported by the Second Brigade of British troops, composed of the Fifth, Twenty-eighth, Thirty-fifth, and Forty-ninth Regiments of Foot, commanded by Brigadier-general Leslie; and by the Brigade of Hessians, composed of Linsing's, Mingerode's, Lengereek's, and Koehler's Regiments of Grenadiers and his own Regiment of Chasseurs, commanded by Colonel Donop—the last mentioned Brigade to be taken from the right of the Army, where it had been posted—for the purpose of assaulting the position on Chatterton's-hill, in front; and Colonel Rall was ordered to move the Brigade which he commanded, on a charge, on the right of the Americans, simultaneously with the movement of the Hessian forlorn-hope and its supporting parties, on their front.[2]

The appearance of the Royal Army, as the main body was thus halted, with detachments moving towards the Bronx, for the proposed assault on Chatterton's-hill, was thus described by an eye-witness, himself an Officer among the Americans who were, then, awaiting the assault on their position: "Its appearance was truly magnificent. A bright autumnal "sun shed its full lustre on their polished arms; and "the rich array of dress and military equipage gave an "imposing grandeur to the scene, as they advanced, in "all the pomp and circumstances of War, to give us "battle;"[3] and, with the main bodies of the two armies, each resting on its arms, anxious spectators of the scene,[4] the Battalion of Hessians which had been designated for the forlorn-hope, in the proposed assault, and the British Regiments who had been detached for its support, moved, steadily, toward the Bronx, in front of the hill, on their mission of death.

It is probable that the little river, where the assaulting party attempted to pass it, was deeper than elsewhere, above or below that place, as it has been, during the entire period of our personal knowledge of the locality; and the Hessian forlorn-hope, consequently, found "some difficulty in passing" the stream;[5] but it struggled successfully, and evidently reached the opposite bank without having sustained any loss, the Twenty-eighth and Thirty-fifth Regiments of British Foot, followed by the Fifth and Forty-ninth Regiments of the same arm of the service, and, subsequently, by the Brigade of Hessians commanded by Colonel Donop,[6] finding "a place most practica-"ble"—probably "the ford," where the fugitive New Englanders and their Hessian pursuers had passed the river, earlier in the morning, was the more practicable place referred to[7]—hastening forward, in the

[1] *General Howe to Lord George Germaine*, "NEW-YORK, 30 November, "1776."

General Howe did not state which particular Battalion of Hessians was thus employed; and we have not found, in any of the contemporary authorities, anything which throws any light on the subject.

Bancroft, who has enjoyed unusual opportunities for acquiring information on the subject of the German mercenaries, has said, (*History of the United States*, original edition, ix., 181; centenary edition, v., 441,) that that forlorn-hope was composed of the Lossberg Battalion; but if, as he has conceded on another page, that Battalion was a portion of the Brigade commanded by Colonel Rall, it was, already on the western bank of the Bronx, and in position; and it is not to be supposed that it would have been withdrawn from that important position to the eastern bank of the river, by way of the ford, and then moved to the western bank, again, at a place where the depth of water made the passage much more difficult, as a forlorn-hope; while it could have acted as such a forlorn-hope, had that been desired, by simply marching up the Mill-lane, and climbing up the side of the hill, without the unnecessary labor and risk of passing and re passing the river.

That Battalion of Hessians who formed the forlorn-hope continues to be, to us, a subject on which we need and seek for further information, especially since it was definitely and very reasonably stated in *The Annual Register for* 1776, (History of Europe, *178,) that it was one of the Battalions of the Brigade commanded by Colonel Donop; in which *The History of the War in America*, Edit. Dublin, 1779, (i., 195), concurred, both of which statements are in entire harmony with our own conclusions, on that subject, at the present time.

[2] *General Howe to Lord George Germaine*, "NEW-YORK, 30 November, "1776."

The Regiments of which the Second Brigade was composed were named in General Howe's despatch to Lord Germaine, above mentioned, and in the *Return of the Killed, Wounded, etc.*, of the Brigade, in the action: those of which the Brigade commanded by Colonel Donop was composed may be seen in the same *Return*, as well as in the *Report of the distribution of the Army*, made by General Howe.

[3] Captain William Hull, quoted in *The Revolutionary Services and Civil Life of General William Hull*, by his daughter, 51.

Concerning the same subject, General Heath, who was on the opposite extremity of the line of the main body, wrote, (*Memoirs*, 78,) "The sun "shone bright; their arms glittered; and, perhaps, troops were never "shown to more advantage, than these now appeared."

[4] *General Howe to Lord George Germaine*, "NEW-YORK, 30 November, "1776;" [Hall's] *History of the Civil War in America*, i., 208, 209; Gordon's *History of the American Revolution*, ii., 311; Stedman's *History of the American War*, i., 215; etc.

[5] *General Howe to Lord George Germaine*, "NEW-YORK, 30 November, "1776."

See, also, *The Annual Register for* 1776, History of Europe, *178; *History of the War in America*, Edit. Dublin; 1779, i., 195, etc.

[6] *General Howe to Lord George Germaine*, "NEW-YORK, 30 November, "1776."

See, also, *The Annual Register for* 1776, History of Europe, *178; etc.

It is very probable that it was that accidental separation of the Regiments composing the support of the Hessian forlorn-hope, and the consequent assault on the Americans in three distinct movements, which led Captain Hull, (in Campbell's *Revolutionary Services and Civil Life of General William Hull*, 55,) to suppose the assault had been originally ordered to be made, in that manner.

[7] In what manner the assaulting party crossed the Bronx-river has been made the subject of the speculations of several modern writers, led and, probably, inspired by the unscrupulous John C. Hamilton, (*History of the Republic of the United States*, i., 133,) who said the Hessian forlorn-hope "refused to wade the tangled stream; and a temporary bridge was begun" and, finally, completed,—of which bridge, he related several incidents,

order in which we have named them, for the support of the shivering, half-drowned Germans, who were undoubtedly waiting, on the western bank of the stream, for their co-operation.

When the movement of the assaulting party, toward the ford, was seen from the summit of the hill, Colonel Haslet applied to General McDougal for the two field-pieces, in order that a fire might be opened on the advancing column; but General McDougal spared only one of the two guns; and that was so poorly appointed that the Colonel was obliged, personally, to assist in dragging it along the rear of his Regiment, to the place where he desired to post it. While it was being thus slowly dragged along the rear of the line of Americans, it is said that a shot from the Hessian guns struck its carriage, scattering the shot, etc., and leaving a wad of tow blazing in the middle of the *debris*. With the exception of a single man, who "was prevailed upon to tread out the blaze and col-"lect the shot," "all the Artillery-men fled," leaving Colonel Haslet and the field-piece entirely unsupported; but it appears that some of these later fugitives returned; made a couple of discharges on the enemy; and then retired, "with the field-piece," not to be seen again, until after they were securely quartered, with the main body of the Army, within the lines, on the other side of the river.[1]

The Twenty-eighth and Thirty-fifth Regiments were the first portion of the supporting party who succeeded in crossing the river;[2] and they moved from the ford, along the road which has more recently been known as "The Mill-lane," extending between the base of Chatterton's-hill and the bank of the Bronx, until they had reached a point which was opposite to the right of the American line, on the top of the hill,[3] when they faced to the left and, with the shivering Hessians on their front, they climbed up the steep and rugged hill-side, in good order and with the greatest steadiness,[4] the fire of the Hessian Artillerists, on the opposite side of the river, at least that portion of it which was directed against the American right, having been suspended, in order that they might not be exposed to unnecessary danger.[5]

On that portion of the American line which was exposed to that assault, on its front, as well as to the movement of the Hessian Brigade commanded by Colonel Rall, who had been ordered to charge on its right flank, simultaneously with the movement on its front,

---

of each of which his father's Company of Artillery and his father were, invariably, the principal subjects.

Such a speculation would require little reflection, in order to show its improbability to any one; but Lossing, (*Field-book of the Revolution*, original edition, ii., 822;) Irving,* (*Life of George Washington*, ii., 392;) and others having followed that leader, and repeated his errors. But General Howe's despatch to Lord George Germaine left no room for doubting, and clearly indicated that the troops forded the stream; Sauthier's *Plan of the Operations*, etc., (the British official Map,) clearly indicated that the Royal troops crossed the river at "The Ford," designated on the Map; *The Plan of the Country from Frog's Point to Croton River*, (General Washington's Map,) did the same, also designating the "Ford;" *The Annual Register for* 1776, (History of Europe, 178,*) clearly understood the river was forded; Stedman, in his *History of the American War*, (i., 214,) said, "A part of our left wing passed the ford, which was "entirely under command of our cannon;" Sergeant Lamb, of the Welsh Fusileers, in his *Journal of Occurrences during the late American War*, (page 126,) said the entire assaulting party, whom he described, in detail, "marched down and crossed the ford;" Doctor Andrews, in his *History of the War*, (ii., 215,) stated the assaulting party "marched down "to the ford, and crossed it;" General Heath, an eye-witness of the movement, stated, in his *Memoirs*, (page 78,) that "a part of the left col-"umn, composed of British and Hessians, forded the river," etc.; Chief-justice Marshall, in his *Life of George Washington*, (ii., 164,) with General Washington's papers before him, clearly knew nothing of any bridge, constructed by the Royal Army; and Doctor Sparks, also with the papers of General Washington before him, in his *Life of George Washington*, (page 196,) after having described all the troops who had been ordered to make the assault, said, "they forded the Bronx, and "formed in good order on the other side;" and we prefer to follow our own convictions, that no bridge was constructed by the Royal Army, on that occasion, especially since these well-considered convictions are so amply sustained by such unquestionable authorities.

With the story of the bridge, other similarly groundless stories for which that phantom bridge had afforded foundations, notwithstanding the effect with which they have been related by their inventor, also vanish as the reader will shortly see.

* Mr. Irving, subsequently, explained to us, personally, how he had fallen into the error; and requested us to pay no respect to the erroneous statements, contained in his work, concerning them.

[1] *Colonel Haslet to General Cæsar Rodney*, "November 12, 1776."

Among the creations of John C. Hamilton's very able but very unscrupulous pen was one, based on the story of the bridge which we have already noticed, concerning the Artillery Company of which his father, Alexander Hamilton, was the Captain, and what he assumed to have been the wonderful services of that Company, on the occasion now under notice.

As we have already stated, (*vide page* 263, *ante*,) there are very grave doubts concerning Captain Hamilton's presence, with the Company, on Chatterton's-hill, on the eventful day of the Battle; and it is of questionable propriety, therefore, to identify him with the shortcomings of his command, so graphically portrayed by Colonel Haslet, in his letter to General Rodney, to which we have referred, in the text—shortcomings which were certainly such as reflected nothing else than disgrace on both the body of the Company and the Officer who was in command, on that occasion, whomsoever he may have been.

Generals Washington, Howe, Cornwallis, Robertson, and Heath, and Captains Harris and Hall, all of whom witnessed the action and described it, and Gordon, Stedman, Marshall, and Sparks, all of them standard historians, whose advantages for acquiring accurate information were in nowise neglected, were uniformly and rigidly silent on the subject of the alleged services of Captain Hamilton's Company of Artillery; while the adverse testimony of Colonel Haslet, which we have stated in the text, supported, in a great measure by that of Captain Hall, the latter concerning the other of the two pieces and those who manned it, on the extreme left of the line, (Campbell's *The Revolutionary Services and Civil Life of General William Hull*, 74,) leaves nothing, concerning that Company, on that occasion, to which the admirers of Alexander Hamilton can refer, with any pleasure, the pretensions of his son, to which we have referred, to the contrary notwithstanding.

[2] *General Howe to Lord George Germaine*, "NEW-YORK, 30 November, "1776;" *The Annual Register for* 1776, History of Europe, 178*; *History of the War in America*, Edit. Dublin: 1779, i., 195; etc.

[3] Sauthier's *Plan of the Operations of the King's Army*, etc.

General Heath, an eye-witness, said, that, after they had "forded the "river," they "marched along, under the cover of the hill, until they "had gained sufficient ground to the left of the Americans, when, by "facing to the left," etc.—(*Memoirs*, 78.)

[4] *General Howe to Lord George Germaine*, "NEW-YORK, 30 November, "1776;" *The Annual Register for* 1776, History of Europe, 178*; etc.

General Heath, who witnessed the movement, said that, "by facing "to the left, their column became a line, parallel with the Americans, "when they briskly ascended the hill. . . . —(*Memoirs*, 78.)

[5] *Memoirs of General Heath*, 78, 79.

were posted, as we have already stated, the Regiment of Massachusetts Militia commanded by Colonel Brooks, sheltered behind a stone wall and supported by the remains of the Maryland Regiment commanded by Colonel Smallwood,[1] and, probably, by the Third Regiment of New Yorkers commanded by Colonel Ritzema;[2] and, against these, the two assaulting parties simultaneously directed their overwhelming power. There was no Artillery to hurl destruction on either of the assailants: since, by that time, the Delaware Regiment, immediately on their left, was confronted by the Fifth and Forty-ninth Regiments, who had also crossed the river and were climbing the hill-side, "zealous to distinguish themselves," there was no support for the hard-pressed "Maccaronis" and their New York comrades: and nothing else than their own resolute wills and their strong arms and their not generally trusty and always ill-supplied muskets were there, to support those less than eleven hundred Officers and Privates in their approaching struggle with two well-disciplined, well-armed, well-commanded British Regiments, besides the Hessian forlorn-hope, on their front, and three equally well-disciplined, well-armed, and well-commanded Hessian Regiments, on their right flank.

It is recorded that the Regiment of Militia, commanded by Colonel Brooks, notwithstanding the shelter afforded by the stone wall, "fled in confusion, "without more than a random, scattering fire;"[3] leaving the Marylanders and New-Yorkers, alone and unsupported; and it also recorded that these last-named Regiments advanced to the brow of the hill, meeting their assailants, and throwing on them, while they were climbing the hill-side, an effective, plunging fire, compelling them to fall back.[4] But the retreat of the Militia, to whom appears to have been assigned the part of holding Colonel Rall in check, having entirely exposed the right flank of the two Regiments to the charge of his Brigade, while the three Regiments of British and Hessian troops who were climbing up the eastern face of the hill, notwithstanding the check which they had sustained, were rallied and renewed their assault on the front of the position, the conflict was too unequal to be long-sustained; and, notwithstanding the stubborn bravery which was necessary to sustain it, with such great odds against the Americans, during the long period of not less than a quarter of an hour,[5] the two brave Regiments were compelled to "give way"[6]—they fell back, fighting as they went, as brave men would be likely to do, under such circumstances.

But the action on Chatterton's-hill was not confined to the simultaneous assaults on the front and right flanks of the Americans who occupied it. Very closely after the Twenty-eighth and Thirty-fifth, the Fifth and Forty-ninth Regiments also forded the Bronx; and moved to the positions which had been assigned to them, respectively; and climbed up the side of the hill;[7] and assaulted the position which was occupied by "The Blue Hen's Chickens"—the Regiment of Delaware troops, commanded by Colonel Haslet—"foemen worthy of their steel." That Regiment numbered very few, if any more, than three hundred fighting Officers and Privates;[8] and yet, single-handed—the two Regiments on its right were already engaged, with assailants on both their front and flank; and the First New York Regiment and the Regiment of Connecticut troops, the latter commanded by Colonel Charles Webb, were also employed in opposing Colonel Donop's Brigade of Hessians, who were "ascending the height, with the greatest alacrity and "in the best of order"—that single regiment bravely sustained the attack, until after the Regiments which had covered its right had given way, when "part of "the first three Companies of the Regiment also re-"treated, in disorder," with considerable loss.[9] The left of the Regiment, however, with the greater number of its Officers, notwithstanding the retreat of the Regiments on its right and that of its own three Companies had exposed its right to the combined assaults of, at least, the Hessian Battalion who had been the forlorn-hope and two of the British Regiments and Colonel Rall's entire Brigade, while two other British Regiments were on its front, fell back only far enough to occupy "a fence, on the top of the hill," a position which it continued to occupy and defend, successfully, until the two Regiments which covered its left had also given way, when, it, also, "retired," the last of the Americans who remained on the hill, and that resolute force, small as it was, who held back the successful assailants, then eager to become pursuers, and covered the retreat of those who, then, remained of the defenders of Chatterton's-hill.[10]

---

[1] *Colonel Haslet to General Cæsar Rodney*, "November 12, 1776."

[2] We have found no mention of the movement of the Regiment commanded by Colonel Ritzema for the support of the Regiments commanded by Colonel Brooks and Smallwood, on the right of the line; but it is reasonable that support was needed, there; and there is satisfactory evidence that Colonel Ritzema and his command *were really there, during the action*; we shall not stop to enquire just when they went to that very exposed position.

[3] *Colonel Haslet to General Cæsar Rodney*, "November 12, 1776."

[4] *Letter to a Gentleman in Annapolis*, dated "WHITE-PLAINS, October 29, "1776."

[5] "After a smart engagement for about a quarter of an hour, obliged "our men to give way"—(*Colonel Robert H. Harrison to the President of the Congress*, "WHITE-PLAINS, October 29, 1776.")

"After a very smart engagement for fifteen or twenty minutes, they "obliged our men to give way."—(*Colonel Robert H. Harrison to General Schuyler*, "WHITE PLAINS, November 1, 1776.")

"The Militia Regiment fled * * Colonel Smallwood, in a quarter "of an hour afterwards, gave way, also."—(*Colonel Haslet to General Cæsar Rodney*, "November 12, 1776.")

[6] *Colonel Haslet to General Cæsar Rodney*, "November 12, 1776."

[7] *General Howe to Lord George Germaine*, "NEW-YORK, 30 November, "1776;" *The Annual Register for 1776*, History of Europe, 178[illegible]; *History of the War in America*, Edit. Dublin: 1779, i., 1[illegible]; etc.

[8] *Returns of the Strength of the Regiments engaged*, etc. (Vide page 269, post.)

[9] *Colonel Haslet to General Cæsar Rodney*, "November 12, 1776."

[10] *Colonel Haslet to General Cæsar Rodney*, "November 12, 1776."

But the action was, also, not confined to the assaults on nor to the defences of the right and center of the Americans, on the top of that notable hill. The four Regiments composing the Brigade commanded by General Leslie, were soon followed, "with the "greatest alacrity and in the best order," through the river, at the ford, and up the Mill-lane, and up the eastern face of the hill, by the Chasseurs and by three, if not by, four, Regiments of Hessian Grenadiers, composing the Brigade commanded by Colonel Donop.[1] In front of these, on the summit of the hill, were the skeleton First New York Regiment, formerly commanded by General McDougal, but then evidently without Field-officers and commanded by one of its Captains; and the Regiment of Connecticut troops commanded by Colonel Charles Webb, very little stronger in effective men, than the other; and, very probably, one of the two field-pieces which constituted the armament of the Company of New-York Artillery of whom Alexander Hamilton was the official commander—the other of the two pieces, as the reader will remember, was posted on the extreme right of the line, under the command of Colonel Haslet.[2] All these numbered, in the aggregate, not many, if any, more than four hundred fighting Officers and Privates;[3] and, with their only piece of artillery dismounted, evidently before the assailants commenced to ascend the hill,[4] and without any support or defensive works, it is scarcely probable that much was expected from so feeble a body, in the face of so heavy a body of assailants. But the records indicate that all those of the two feeble Regiments who were present on the field, performed their duty satisfactorily to the Commander-in-chief;[5] and, we are told that, when an effort was made by the assailants to turn the left of the line, a detachment from Colonel Webb's Regiment, commanded by Captain William Hull, defeated the attempt, with spirit and promptitude, although he was opposed by more than double the number of his own command.[6]

On every part of the ground, except those portions which had been occupied by the Company of New-York Artillery and the Regiment of Massachusetts Militia, the battle had been resolutely sustained;[7] and the assailants, in more than one instance, had been compelled to fall back;[8] but the opposing forces were so unequal in their strength that a successful occupation of the hill could not have been expected, by any one—indeed, the fact that the entire detachment was not cut off from the main body of the Army, and captured by the enemy, reflects the highest honor on those who occupied the hill, and fills one with wonder and admiration. It is doubtful if any who were not too much disabled to be removed, were taken prisoners; all who were able to move off the hill, moved off, by the left flank, by way of the road which led from the White Plains to Dobbs's ferry[9]—they moved sullenly,[10] "in a great body, neither run-"ning nor observing the best order,"[11] covered by a portion of the Delaware Regiment[12]—and, having crossed the bridge over which the roadway passed the Bronx, the site of that which now affords a passage over the river, near the present railroad-station at the White Plains, they fell in on the rear of General Beall's Maryland Flying Camp, which General Putnam was leading for their support, on the hill;[13] and joined the main body of the Army, within the lines.

After he had gained possession of the hill, the enemy made no attempt whatever to pursue the retreating Americans; but formed and dressed his line,[14] and

---

[1] *General Howe to Lord George Germaine*, "NEW-YORK, 30 November, "1776." *The Annual Register for* 1776, History of Europe, 178*; *The History of the War in America*, Edit. Dublin: 1779, 195; etc.

It is possible that one of the Regiments of that Brigade had been detailed, to act as the forlorn-hope, in the assault, as we have already stated.

[2] Vide page 265, ante.

[3] *Returns of the Strength of the Regiments engaged*, etc. (Vide page 269, post.)

[4] Captain Hull's unpublished *Memoir*, quoted in Campbell's *Revolutionary Services and Civil Life of General William Hull*, 54.

As the fire of the Hessian Artillerists had been suspended when the assailants had commenced to ascend the hill, it is very evident that, when Colonel Donop, the last to reach the ground, assaulted the left of the American line, there was no artillery on the hill, in front of him, mounted and effective.

[5] General McDougal complained of Colonel Webb; but, in *General Orders*, General Washington stated, "The representation made of Colonel "Webb's Regiment, yesterday, by General McDougal, appearing to be "a mistake, and that they kept the post assigned them, notwithstanding "a severe cannonade, the General takes the first opportunity to make it "known, to prevent any unfavorable impression."—(*General Orders*, "HEAD-QUARTERS, WHITE PLAINS, October 29, 1776.")

[6] Captain Hull's unpublished *Memoir*, quoted in Campbell's *Revolutionary Services and Civil Life of General William Hull*, 55; *Governor Brooks to the President of the Court Martial for the trial of General Hull*, "BOSTON, February 4, 1814."

[7] "The gaining of this important post took up a considerable time, "which was prolonged by the enemy's still supporting a broken and "scattered engagement, in defence of the adjoining walls and hedges." [*fences?*]—(*The Annual Register for* 1776, History of Europe, *178.)

The History of the War in America, Edit. Dublin, 1779, (i., 195;) Gordon's *History of the American Revolution*, (ii., 341;) and others, also, bear testimony to the gallantry of the American troops.

. . "our Troops made as good a Stand as could be expected and "did not quit the Ground, till they came to push their bayonets."—*Lieutenant-colonel Tilghman to his Father*, "WHITE-PLAINS, 31st October, "1776."

[8] *Letter to a Gentleman in Annapolis*, dated "WHITE-PLAINS, October 29, "1776," published in *The Pennsylvania Journal*, No. 1771, PHILADELPHIA, Wednesday, November 13, 1776.

[9] Our own knowledge of the ground and its approaches enabled us to make the statement which appears in the text; and, by a reference to *A Plan of the Country from Frog's Point to Croton River*, the reader may see the evidence of the accuracy of that statement.

[10] *Letter from the White Plains*, dated October 28, 1776, at two o'clock, P.M., published in *The Pennsylvania Evening Post*, Vol. II., No. 278, PHILADELPHIA, Thursday, October 31, 1776, and in *The Pennsylvania Journal*, No. 1770, PHILADELPHIA, Wednesday, November 6, 1776.

[11] *Memoirs of Major-general Heath*, 79.

See, also, *William Harrison to the Maryland Council of Safety*, "GEORGE-"TOWN, KENT-COUNTY, 28 November, 1776."

[12] *Colonel Haslet to General Cæsar Rodney*, "November 12."

[13] *Letter to a Gentleman in Annapolis*, dated "WHITE-PLAINS, October 29 "1776;" published in *The Pennsylvania Journal*, No. 1771, PHILADELPHIA, Wednesday, November 13, 1776.

[14] *Memoirs of General Heath*, 79.

General Howe, in his despatch to Lord George Germaine, dated "NEW-"YORK, 30 November, 1776," stated that, after the engagement, "the "Hessian Grenadiers," [*those who had assaulted the left of the Americans*,] "were ordered forward, upon the heights, within cannon-shot of the "entrenchments, the Bronx, from its winding course, being still between

prepared his dinner, for the purpose of doing which he tore down and burned a barn which belonged to John Hunt, on property, on the western portion of the hill, which, in our younger days, belonged to his two sons, Thomas and Jacob Hunt.[1]

The strength of the Americans, under General Spencer, who were engaged on the Plain; who were alarmed at either the Hessians or the Light Dragoons; and who fled, over the river and far away, among the hills of Greenburgh, was, as we have already stated, not far from twenty-five hundred effective Officers and Privates:[2] that of the Regiments who composed the force on the top of the hill, who defended the position, and who were really the heroes of the day, exclusive of the Company of Artillery, who rendered no effective service, was not far from seventeen hundred effective Officers and Privates.[1] The strength of all the force which was directed against the middle body of men cannot be definitely ascertained, since the Hessian Artillerists, on the eastern bank of the river whose fire was, certainly, to some extent, effective, were clearly as much a portion of that antagonistic force as those who crossed the river and assaulted the position or as those who charged on the right flank of the struggling Americans, and assisted in driving them from the hill. Besides those Hessian Artillerists, there were four Regiments of British troops, commanded by General Leslie; the Hessian Regiment, probably from Colonel Donop's command, who occupied the place of danger and honor, as the forlorn-hope; the three Regiments of Hessians, commanded by Colonel Rall; and the four or five Regiments of Hessians,

"them and the enemy's," [*the Americans.*] "right flank; the Second "Brigade of British," [*those who had assaulted the fronts of the right and centre of the Americans,*] "formed in the rear of the Hessian Grena-"diers; and the two Brigades of Hessians, on the left of the Second "Brigade, with their left upon the road leading from Tarrytown to the "White Plains"—that is to say, the entire force, on the western bank of the Bronx, was moved northward, until its left was above that old road, still continued, which extends from the bridge, near the railroad-station, westward, over Chatterton's-hill.

[1] Information communicated to us, personally, more than thirty years since, by the two gentlemen named, who, then, were our near neighbors and personal friends.

[2] The *Returns of the Killed, Wounded, and Missing*, in each of the several Regiments who had formed that bashful detachment leave no room for doubt concerning the Regiments of whom it was really composed—indeed, there may have been others whose modesty forbade the making of any such Returns, and who have thereby escaped our notice.

The Regiments of whom we find mention, as we have already stated, were those commanded, respectively, by Colonels Silliman, Selden, Sage, and Douglass (the latter commanded by Lieutenant-colonel Arnold,) all belonging to the Brigade commanded by General Wadsworth; the Regiment commanded by Colonel Chester, of the Brigade commanded by Colonel Sargent; the Regiments commanded, respectively, by Colonels Baldwin, Douglass, and Lieutenant-colonel Ely, of the Brigade commanded by General Saltonstall; and the Regiments commanded, respectively, by Colonels Holman and Smith, of the Brigade commanded by General Fellows—all of them New Englanders and some of them experts in running, as was shown at Kip's-bay, in the preceding September.

The Returns of the strength of each of those several Regiments, on the twenty-first of September, on the fifth of October, and on the third of November,—the last, five days after the action,—were as follows:

Regiments.	September 21.								
	Com. Officers.	Staff.	Non-com. Off.	Fit for Duty.	Sick, present.	Sick, absent.	On Command.	Furloughed.	Total, Rank and File.
Colonel Silliman's	26	4	47	194	57	81	60	. .	432
Colonel Selden's	30	4	45	271	46	116	52	. .	485
Colonel Sage's	33	4	44	217	54	112	63	. .	487
Colonel Douglass's	. .	. .	. .	. .	. .	. .	. .	. .	. .
Colonel Chester's	32	4	47	262	104	38	149	1	554
Colonel Baldwin's	25	5	38	225	147	19	77	. .	468
Colonel Douglass's	. .	. .	. .	. .	. .	. .	. .	. .	. .
Lt.-Col. Ely's	. .	. .	. .	. .	. .	. .	. .	. .	. .
Colonel Holman's	34	5	46	344	76	102	72	. .	594
Colonel Smith's	35	6	48	336	85	76	46	. .	543
Total	. .	. .	. .	. .	. .	. .	. .	. .	. .

Regiments.	October 5.								
	Com. Officers.	Staff.	Non-com. Off.	Fit for Duty.	Sick, present.	Sick, absent.	On Command.	Furloughed.	Total, Rank and File.
Colonel Silliman's	21	2	47	152	83	105	40	. .	380
Colonel Selden's	30	4	45	240	73	107	73	. .	476
Colonel Sage's	32	4	45	162	194	155	62	. .	454
Colonel Douglass's	22	3	49	201	62	120	93	. .	476
Colonel Chester's	31	4	45	262	123	23	133	2	542
Colonel Baldwin's	28	5	37	234	122	34	74	. .	454
Colonel Douglass's	24	4	41	144	24	5	17	. .	160
Lieut.-Col. Ely's	30	3	39	219	6	27	9	2	283
Colonel Holman's	31	5	47	286	118	70	87	. .	589
Colonel Smith's	35	5	48	327	90	74	48	. .	539
Total	284	39	443	2227	925	720	643	4	4123

Regiments.	November 3.									
	Com. Officers.	Staff.	Non-com. Off.	Fit for Duty.	Sick, present.	Sick, absent.	On Command.	Furloughed.	Total, Rank and File.	Total, Officers and men.
Colonel Silliman's	14	2	26	149	18	160	58	. .	376	418
Colonel Selden's	15	2	27	224	42	142	69	. .	477	511
Colonel Sage's	15	2	46	170	72	186	51	. .	478	541
Colonel Douglass's	19	4	37	228	36	128	72	1	465	525
Colonel Chester's	9	4	25	234	107	41	145	3	520	578
Colonel Baldwin's	27	3	44	288	50	32	56	. .	450	530
Colonel Douglass's	21	4	35	56	41	25	22	1	184	240
Lieut.-Col. Ely's	29	3	38	119	5	57	18	. .	240	317
Colonel Holman's	22	4	29	306	102	84	80	. .	572	627
Colonel Smith's	13	5	36	311	51	115	59	. .	546	584
Total	184	33	343	2076	572	970	613	5	4,236	4796

It will be seen that five hundred and sixty Officers, Staff, non-commissioned Officers and Musicians, and two thousand and seventy-six Privates, present and fit for duty, survived the hazards of the engagement, and had returned to the Camp, five days after the Battle; and the reader will readily perceive that our estimate of the effective strength of the detachment on the occasion under consideration, is a reasonable one, sustained as it is by the contemporary statement of Lieutenant-colonel Tilghman, one of the Aides of General Washington, (*Letter to his father*, "WHITE-PLAINS, 31st October, 1776;") and by that of Brigade-major Tallmadge, of General Wadsworth's Brigade, himself a participant in the affair on the Plain and in the discreditable retreat, (*Memoir of Colonel Benjamin Tallmadge*, prepared by himself, 143) for both of which see pages 260, 261, ante.

[1] The Returns of the strength of those several Regiments, on the

commanded by Colonel Donop, each or all of whom could not have contained less than six hundred

twenty-first of September, the fifth of October, and on the third of November—the last, five days after the Battle,—were as follows:

Regiments.	September 21.								
	Com. Officers.	Staff.	Non com. Officers.	Fit for Duty.	Sick, present.	Sick, absent.	On Command.	Furloughed.	Total, Rank and File.
Colonel Brooks's*	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Colonel Smallwood's	41	5	48	427	30	294	80	..	840
Colonel Ritzema's	26	3	33	205	22	60	66	4	417
Colonel Haslet's	32	5	41	135	..	125	8	..	568
Late Col. McDougal's / First New-York Reg't.	25	5	20	215	49	44	79	..	287
Colonel Webb's	13	2	25	219	89	38	192	2	540
Total	137	20	167	1561	199	561	425	6	2752

Regiments.	October 5.								
	Com. Officers.	Staff.	Non-com. Officers.	Fit for Duty.	Sick, present.	Sick, absent.	On Command.	Furloughed.	Total, Rank and File.
Colonel Brooks's	†	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Colonel Smallwood's	‡31	5	49	322	190	191	71	..	774
Colonel Ritzema's	18	3	28	217	34	57	72	6	386
Colonel Haslet's	27	4	34	385	6	140	29	..	569
Late Col. McDougal's / First New-York Reg't.	14	5	19	153	30	67	78	..	328
Colonel Webb's	9	3	21	185	96	40	210	2	532
Total	99	20	151	1262	356	504	460	8	2590

Regiments.	November 3.									
	Com. Officers.	Staff.	Non com. Officers.	Fit for Duty.	Sick, present.	Sick, absent.	On Command.	Furloughed.	Total, Rank and File.	Total, Officers and Privates.
Colonel Brooks's	30	5	50	340	81	46	..	13	486	571
Colonel Smallwood's	30	8	37	298	84	354	57	1	794	899
Colonel Ritzema's	21	4	27	198	12	61	61	10	342	344
Colonel Haslet's	13	3	21	273	26	228	21	..	548	585
Late Col. McDougal's / 1st New-York Reg't. §	21	5	19	142	22	76	13	1	251	293
Colonel Webb's	16	3	27	191	73	46	208	9	527	573
Total	131	28	181	1442	298	811	360	40	2951	3291

It will be seen that three hundred and forty Officers, Staff, non-commissioned Officers, and Musicians, and one thousand, four hundred, and forty-two Privates, present and fit for duty, survived the Battle, and, five days after that event, were returned as effective. The losses which they had sustained, in the action, and the probable absence of some, on that occasion, must be taken into the account; and we believe that the number of Officers and Privates who were actually engaged was about that which we have stated in the text.

Gordon, (*History of the American Revolution*, ii., 341,) reduced the num

* Not, then, in the service.

† "General Lincoln's Militia from Massachusetts, so scattered and "ignorant of the forms of *Returns*, that none can be got."

‡ In the original *Returns*, the total of Rank and File is stated at 836: we have been unable to ascertain where the error in the details, is.

§ In the original Returns, the total of Rank and File is stated at 314: we have been unable to ascertain where the error in the details, is.

Officers and Privates, making an aggregate of about seven thousand, five hundred effective men.[1]

The loss sustained by the Americans was not as great as was, at first, supposed[2]—the return to the Camp of the greater number of the fugitive New Englanders reduced the supposed losses from "between "four or five hundred in killed, wounded, and miss-"ing," which was the first estimate, to twenty-two killed, twenty-four wounded, and one missing, in the detachment commanded by General Spencer;[3] and, exclusive of the losses sustained by the Regiments commanded, respectively, by Colonels Haslet and Brooks, of which no Returns have been found, the loss of those who were on the top of the hill and who fought the battle, was two Captains, four Sergeants, one Corporal, and eighteen Privates, killed; one Colonel, three Lieutenants, one Ensign, four Sergeants, and forty-three Privates, wounded; and sixteen Pri-

ber of those who remained, after the Militia had given way, to six hundred men; Chief-justice Marshall, (*History of George Washington*, ii., 502,) and Doctor Sparks, (*Life of General Washington*, 199,) each with the papers of General Washington before him, stated the force under General McDougal was "about sixteen hundred" men.

[1] General Howe was silent concerning the numerical strength of the force which he had thus employed; and none of the British authorities were any more communicative. Stedman, however, (*History of the American War*, i., 215,) clearly intimated that the force which was required to take and occupy Chatterton's-hill, when diverted for that purpose, so greatly weakened the Royal Army, then on the White Plains, that "it was obvious that the latter could no longer expediently "attempt anything against the enemy's" [*the Americans*'] "main "body."

We may be allowed to say, in this connection, that the practise of that period, in making mention of the strength of detachments or of that of the Army itself, was to include only the Rank and File, excluding the Commissioned Officers, the Staff, and the non-commissioned Officers, all of them, to some extent, at least, effective fighting men.

[2] Compare the letter from Colonel Robert H. Harrison, the Secretary of General Washington, to the President of the Congress, dated "WHITE-"PLAINS, 29 October, 1776," with General Washington's letter to the same, dated "WHITE-PLAINS, 6 November, 1776," in the latter of which he said, "I am happy to inform you, that, in the engagement on Mon-"day so nuaight, I have reason to believe our loss was, by no means, so "considerable as was conjectured, at first."

See, also, *Colonel Robert H. Harrison's letter to Governor Trumbull*, "WHITE-PLAINS, November 6, 1776;" *the same to Governor Cooke*, "WHITE-PLAINS, November 6, 1776;" etc.

[3] The following table will show the losses which were sustained by each of the several Regiments who composed that detachment:

Regiments.	Killed.			Wounded.							Missg
	Serg'ts.	Corp'ls.	Privates.	Captains.	First Lt.	Sec. Lt.	Ensigns.	Serg'ts.	Corp'l.	Privates.	Privates.
Colonel Silliman's	1	..	4	..	1	1	1	1	1	6	..
Colonel Selden's	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1	..	..	..
Colonel Sage's	..	..	..	1	..	..	..	..	..	1	..
Colonel Douglass's	..	..	3	..	..	..	..	..	..	9	..
Colonel Chester's	..	1	3	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Colonel Baldwin's	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Colonel Douglass's	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1
Lt.-col. Ely's	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1	..	..
Colonel Hilman's	1	..	8	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Colonel Smith's	1	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Total	3	1	18	1	1	1	1	2	1	17	1

vates, missing[1]—among those who were killed were Captains Bracco and Scott, of Colonel Smallwood's Regiment; and, among those who were wounded, were Colonel Smallwood and Lieutenants Goldsmith and Waters, of the same Regiment.[2] General Howe reported to the Home Government, evidently including all who were captured in Westchester-county, that one Captain, two Lieutenants, one Quarter-master, and thirty-five Privates were taken, "October 12—"White Plains;"[3] but we have no means for ascertaining who of these were taken prisoners on the twenty-eighth of October. The loss sustained by the Second Brigade of British troops, commanded by General Leslie, was Lieutenant-colonel Carr, Captains Deering and Gore, Lieutenant Jocelyn, Ensign Eagle, one Sergeant, and twenty-nine Rank and File,[4] killed; Lieutenant-colonel Walcott,[5] Captain Fitzgerald, Captain-lieutenant Massey,[6] Lieutenants Taylor, Banks, and Roberts, twelve Sergeants, and one hundred and two Rank and File,[7] wounded; and two Rank and File,[8] missing.[9] The three Regiments composing the Brigade commanded by Colonel Rall sustained a loss of eight Rank and File, killed; Lieutenant Muhlhausen, one Sergeant, and forty-four Rank and File, wounded; and one horse, killed. The Regiment of Chasseurs and the four Regiments of Grenadiers—one of them, probably, the half-drowned forlorn-hope—composing the Brigade commanded by Colonel Donop, sustained a loss of four Rank and File, killed; Captain De Westerhagen, Lieutenant De Rau, and fourteen Rank and File, wounded; and two Rank and File, missing.[10]

As far as our knowledge of it extends, history is wholly silent, concerning the influences which controlled General Washington and concerning the objects which he had in view, when he determined to occupy Chatterton's-hill, with so large a proportion of his already feeble and uncertain Army, including three of the best, if not the best three, of his Regiments;[11] and, especially, at a later hour, when, at a critical moment and in the face of an overwhelming enemy, he determined, also, to strengthen the force whom he had already sent, and to hold the position, at all hazards, sending, for those purposes, another very strong detachment of those troops in whom he reposed his greatest confidence, as soldiers, and whom he could ill-spare from the insufficiently manned lines which he, himself, was then occupying.

At best, Chatterton's-hill, at that time, was an isolated position; beyond the American lines; too distant to be supported from the main body, in the presence of an enemy occupying the Plains, unless in force and at great risk; with no line of communication with the main body, which was not commanded by the enemy; and with no opening for a retreat of the occupying force, in case of a disaster, unless to the westward, into the neighboring hills of Greenburgh, which were already occupied by the fugitive New Englanders whom General Spencer had attempted to command. It could hardly be considered, therefore, with any degree of propriety, as anything else than a detached and independent position, form-

[1] The following table will show the losses which were sustained by each of the several Regiments who were posted on the hill.

Regiments.	Killed.						Wounded.						Missing.	
	Captains.	Lieut.	Ensign.	Serg'ts.	Corporal.	Privates.	Colonel.	Captains.	Lieut.	Ensign.	Serg'ts.	Corporals.	Privates.	Officers.	Privates.
Colonel Brooks's*	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Colonel Smallwood's	2	.	.	3	.	7	1	.	2	.	.	.	25	.	6
Colonel Ritzema's	.	.	.	.	1	9	.	.	1	1	3	.	10	.	6
Colonel Haslet's*	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Late Col. McDougal's First New-York Reg't.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	1	.	.	.	4
Colonel Webb's	.	.	.	1	.	2	.	.	.	.	.	.	8	.	.
Total, as far as reported	2	.	.	4	1	18	1	.	3	1	4	.	43	.	16

Doctor Pine, in his letter to James Tilghman, dated "CAMP AT THE "WHITE-PLAINS, November 7, 1776," said, "the number of killed and "wounded, as the report is, in the Camp, amounts only to about ninety; "but from the wounded I saw, myself, in the hospital and adjacent "houses, there must, at least, be an hundred and thirty wounded. The "number of killed I don't know."

[2] *Letter to a Gentleman in Annapolis*, dated "WHITE-PLAINS, October 29, "1776;" published in *The Pennsylvania Journal*, No. 1771, PHILADELPHIA, Wednesday, November 13, 1776, and in Force's *American Archives*, V., ii., 1281; *Lieutenant-colonel Gist to the Maryland Council of Safety*, "CAMP BEFORE THE WHITE-PLAINS, 2 November, 1776;" etc.

[3] *Return of Prisoners taken during the Campaign*, 1776, signed by "Jos. "Loring, Commissary of Prisoners," appended to General Howe's despatch to Lord George Germaine, dated "NEW-YORK, 3 December, 1776."

[4] In General Leslie's *Return*, the killed were stated to have been only twenty-two Rank and File.

[5] In General Leslie's *Return*, no mention was made of a Field-officer of the Fifth Regiment having been wounded.

[6] In General Leslie's *Return of Officers wounded*, Captain Massey's name is among those of the Lieutenants, although the tabular statement returns him as a Captain, in which it agrees with General Howe's Report. He was a Captain-Lieutenant.

[7] In General Leslie's *Return*, the wounded were stated to have numbered one hundred and twelve Rank and File.

[8] In General Leslie's *Return*, no mention was made of any missing Rank and File.

[9] In this statement, we have followed General Howe's *Return of Commissioned and Non-commissioned Officers, Rank and File, Killed, Wounded, and Missing*, etc., appended to his despatch to Lord George Germaine, dated "NEW-YORK, 3 December, 1776." We have compared it with the *Return of the Killed and Wounded of the Second Brigade*, etc., made by General Leslie; and find that, although the details of the classifications differ, the aggregate of the British loss is the same—one hundred and fifty-seven Officers and Men.

[10] *General Howe's Return of Commissioned and Non-commissioned Officers, Rank and File, Killed, Wounded, and Missing*, appended to his despatch to Lord George Germaine, dated "NEW-YORK, 3 December, 1776."

It is proper for us to say, however, that that *Return* included all the losses sustained by the Regiments referred to, from the nineteenth to the twenty-eighth of October, both these dates included; and it is possible, therefore, that some of the casualties named in the text were sustained elsewhere than on or near Chatterton's-hill. We have no means for ascertaining their exact losses, on the twenty-eighth of October.

[11] We are not insensible that Stedman, in his *History of the American War*, (i., 214,) said "the reason of their" [*the Americans*,] "occupying "this posture," [*on Chatterton's-hill*,] "is inexplicable, unless it be that "they could not be contained within the works of their Camp;" but the reason assigned was too evidently ridiculous to be regarded with the slightest respect.

* No Returns from these Regiments have been found.

ing no portion of the American lines; and nothing else than a supposition, on the part of General Washington's advisers and on that of the General himself, that the continued occupation of it was absolutely essential to the safety of the main body, in the position which it then occupied, could possibly have led him to make such a costly and hazardous experiment, under the existing circumstances and in the immediate presence of such an overwhelming enemy, as the continued occupation and defence of Chatterton's-hill. But General Washington had evidently planned better than he knew; and, in the providence of God, some results which were more beneficial to the Americans than any which he had conceived and hoped for, were unquestionably derived from that seemingly unpromising experiment of occupying and holding that exceedingly exposed position, on the western bank of the Bronx; among which results, in America, we may mention the effect of that occupation, as an apparent menace against the left flank and rear of the Royal Army, in whatever movement that Army, under General Howe, should make against the American lines; the delay in that evidently projected movement of the Royal Army, to enable its commanding General to remove what appeared to have been a dangerous element from Chatterton's-hill—a delay which enabled the Americans to strengthen their defensive works and to become better prepared for defending them, whenever the Royal Army should move against them;—and the reduction of that great Army, which was, then, in front of the American lines, and ready to move against them, for the purpose of assaulting the Americans who had occupied the hill as well for that of holding the hill, subsequently, which reduction of the strength of his main body compelled General Howe to wait for the arrival of reinforcements, to abandon his intention to assault the works which sheltered the main body of the American Army, and, finally, to retire from Westchester-county—the first-mentioned of which consequences affording still further time and opportunities to General Washington and his feeble command: the latter two affording to the Americans, everywhere, the *eclat*, as well as some of the advantages, of better generalship and of consequent success. All these, among other not much less important results, although they were probably hidden from General Washington, when he devised and ordered the movement, were, unquestionably, among the results, in America, of that "inexplicable" occupation of Chatterton's-hill, on the morning of the twenty-eighth of October, 1776: with the results, in Europe, of that occupation, we have nothing to do, in this place.[1]

As we have elsewhere stated, the advancing columns of the Royal Army had been formed, in line, with the Right resting on the road leading from the White Plains to Mamaroneck, and the Left resting on the

[1] In our preparation of this description of the engagement on Chatterton's-hill, generally called "THE BATTLE OF WHITE-PLAINS," we have examined and used *The Diary of Ewald Hess*; the *Letter from the White Plains*, dated October 28, 1776, published in *The Pennsylvania Journal*, No. 1770, PHILADELPHIA, Wednesday, November 6, 1776; the *Letter from the White-Plains*, dated October 28, 1776, at two o'clock, P.M., published in *The Pennsylvania Evening Post*, Vol. II., No. 278, PHILADELPHIA, Thursday, October 31, 1776, and in *The Pennsylvania Journal*, No. 1770, PHILADELPHIA, November 6, 1776; the *Letter of Colonel Robert H. Harrison to the President of the Congress*, dated "WHITE-PLAINS, October 29, 1776;" the *Letter to a Gentleman in Annapolis*, dated "WHITE-PLAINS, October "29, 1776," published in *The Pennsylvania Journal*, No. 1771, PHILADELPHIA, Wednesday, November 13, 1776; the *Letter from the Camp*, dated WHITE-PLAINS, October 29, 1776, published in *The Freeman's Journal, or New-Hampshire Gazette*, Vol. I., No. 26, PORTSMOUTH, Tuesday, November 19, 1776; *General Order of the Army*, in the case of Colonel Webb, "HEAD-QUARTERS, WHITE-PLAINS, October 29, 1776;" *Lieutenant-colonel Tilghman's letter to William Duer*, dated "HEAD-QUARTERS, WHITE-"PLAINS, October 29, 1776;" *the same to his father*, dated "WHITE-"PLAINS, October 31, 1776;" the *Letter from Stamford*, dated October 30, 1776, published in *The Freeman's Journal, or New-Hampshire Gazette*, Vol. I., No. 25, PORTSMOUTH, Tuesday, November 12, 1776; the *Letter of Colonel Robert H. Harrison to General Schuyler*, "WHITE-PLAINS, NOVEM-"BER 1, 1776;" the *Letter from a Gentleman in the Army*, dated "CAMP "NEAR THE MILLS, ABOUT THREE MILES NORTH OF THE WHITE PLAINS, "November 1, 1776," published in *The Pennsylvania Evening Post*, Vol. II., No. 284, PHILADELPHIA, Thursday, November 14, 1776, in Force's *American Archives*, V., iii., 471-474, and, in a mutilated form, in Frank Moore's *Diary of the American Revolution*, i., 335-337; *Colonel Robert H. Harrison's letter to Governor Trumbull*, dated "WHITE-PLAINS, November 2, 1776;" *Lieutenant-colonel Tilghman's letter to William Duer*, dated "HEAD-QUAR-"TERS, NEAR WHITE-PLAINS, November 2, 1776;" *Colonel Gist's letter to the Maryland Council of Safety*, dated "CAMP BEFORE THE WHITE-"PLAINS, 2 November, 1776;" *General Washington's letter to the President of the Congress*, dated "WHITE-PLAINS, November 6, 1776;" *Colonel Robert H. Harrison's letter to Governor Trumbull*, dated "WHITE-PLAINS, "November 6, 1776;" *Colonel Hoisle's letter to General Cæsar Rodney*, dated "November 12, 1776;" *Doctor Poe's letter to James Tilghman*, dated "CAMP AT THE WHITE-PLAINS, November 7, 1776;" *General Howe's despatch to Lord George Germaine*, dated "NEW-YORK, November "30, 1776;" the *Letter of William Harrison to the Maryland Council of Safety*, dated "GEORGETOWN, KENT-COUNTY, 28th November, "1776;" *General Returns of the Army*, September 21, October 5, and November 3, 1776; *Returns of Killed, Wounded, and Missing*, [in the American Army,] *in several Actions*, published in Force's *American Archives*, V., iii., 715-730; *Return of Commissioned and Non-commissioned Officers and Rank and File, Killed, Wounded, and Missing, from the 17th September to the 16th November, inclusive*, appended to *General Howe's despatch to Lord George Germaine*, "NEW-YORK, 3 December, 1776;" Sauthier's *Plan of the Operations of the King's Army under the Command of Sir William Howe, K.B., in New-York and East New-Jersey against the American Forces commanded by General Washington, from the 12th of October to the 28th of November, 1776*; *A Plan of the Country from Frog's Point to Croton River*; *The Examination of Joseph Galloway, Esq., before a Committee of the House of Commons*; [Galloway's] *Letters to a Nobleman*; *The Narrative of Sir William Howe, . . . with some Observations upon a pamphlet entitled* Letters to a Nobleman; [Galloway's] *Reply to the Observations of* Lieut.-Gen. Sir William Howe, *on a pamphlet entitled Letters to a Nobleman*; Almon's *Parliamentary Register*, Volumes XI., XII., and XIII.; *The Annual Register for 1776*; *The History of the War in America*, Edit., Dublin: 1779; [Hall's] *History of the Civil War in America*; *Essais historiques et politiques sur la Révolution de l'Amérique Septentrionale*, par M. Hilliard d'Auberteuil; Andrews's *History of the War with America, France, Spain, and Holland*; Soulès's *Histoire des Troubles de l'Amérique Anglaise*; Gordon's *History of the American Revolution*; Ramsey's *History of the American Revolution*; Murray's *Impartial History of the War in America*; Stedman's *History of the War in America*; *Memoirs of Major-general Heath*; Chastellux's *Histoire politique et philosophique de la Révolution de l'Amérique Septentrionale*; Marshall's *Life of George Washington*; Warren's *History of the American Revolution*; Adolphus's *History of England*; Sergeant Lamb's *Journal of Occurrences during the Late American War*; Humphreys's *Life of General Putnam*; Paul Allen's *History of the American Revolution*; Morse's *Annals of the American Revolution*; Ramsay's *Life of George Washington*; Pitkin's *Political and Civil History of the United States of America*; Sparks's *Writings of George Washington*; Dunlap's *History of New-York*; Sparks's *Life of George Washington*; Lossing's *Seventeen hun-*

Bronx; and that it had been halted, within a mile of the American lines, to enable a heavy detachment of both British and Hessian troops to dispossess a body of American troops who had occupied Chatterton's-hill, and who appeared to menace the left flank and rear of the Left, in its proposed movement against the American lines.[1] The result of that assault on Chatterton's-hill has, also, been duly noticed;[2] but the success of that movement did not disturb the main body, who remained, resting on its arms, where it had been halted, during the remainder of the day and throughout the following night; and, there, "with "very little alteration," it encamped, on the following day[3]—it had been so much reduced, in effective strength, by the withdrawal of the assaulting parties, and, as was said by an intelligent officer, "the difficulty of co-operation between the Left and Right "wings of our Army was such, that it was obvious "that the latter could no longer expediently attempt "anything against the enemy's main body."[4] It appears, however, that the Right of the Royal Army, who was not expected to participate in the proposed assault on the American lines, and who was not concerned in the assault on Chatterton's-hill, further than to detach the Hessians commanded by Colonel Donop, who were in that wing of the Army, for the purpose of assisting in that important operation, was not inclined to rest, as the Left of the Army had been ordered to do and had done; and a portion of it, at least, was moved forward, on the main road of the Village, in front of the Left of the American lines, which was occupied, as the reader will remember, by the Division commanded by General Heath.[5]

We have been told that the advancing column was led by a detachment of about twenty Light Dragoons, capering and brandishing their sabres, who leaped the fence of a wheat-field, situated at the foot of the hill on which the Regiment commanded by Colonel Malcolm had been posted.[6] The horsemen evidently supposed the hill was unoccupied; and, it is probable, they expected to turn the flank of the American lines, and to secure an easy victory; but Lieutenant Fenno and his field-piece were also on "the South brow of "the hill;"[7] and, when the horsemen approached, he gave them a shot which, "by striking in the midst "of them," killed one of them.[8] The troop was immediately "wheeled, short about, and galloped out of "the field as fast as they came in; rode behind a little "hill, in the road; and faced about;" the other portions of the column, at the same time, as they successively came up, wheeling to the left, by platoons; and, passing through a gateway or bars, directed their march, westward, to the place where the Left of the Army had been halted.[9] With that movement of the extreme Right of the Army, and with that of the Hessian and British troops, on the high grounds, on the western bank of the Bronx, on its extreme Left, already mentioned, the Royal Army closed the operations of the day.

It is undoubtedly true that the delay which was produced by the halt of the Royal Army, on the Plain, was the salvation of the American Army, within the lines; since it afforded time for strengthening the works behind which the latter was, then, posted, and for preparing it for falling back, soon afterwards, and occupying another position, which would be more defensible and not so accessible to the King's troops. But it is scarcely true that, since the morning of the preceding day, the Americans had "drawn back their encampment" and "strengthened their lines by additional works," to such an extent, in either instance, that "the designed "attack upon them," on the morning after the engagement, [*Tuesday, October* 29,] need have been "deferred," for no other reasons than these, notwithstanding General Howe is reported to have informed the Home Government that such had been the case[10]—the reported withdrawal of the American encampment was, probably, nothing more than the removal of the Stores, back, to the high grounds of Newcastle, which was commenced on that day;[11] and, notwithstanding

dred and seventy-six; Campbell's *Revolutionary Services and Civil Life of General William Hull*; Hinman's *Historical Collection of the part sustained by Connecticut, during the War of the Revolution*; Lossing's *Pictorial Field-book of the Revolution*; Hildreth's *History of the United States of America*; Irving's *Life of George Washington*; Hamilton's *History of the Republic of the United States of America, as traced in the Writings of Alexander Hamilton*; Dawson's *Military Retreats through Westchester-county*, in 1776, (an unpublished manuscript;) Moore's *Diary of the American Revolution*; *Memoir of Colonel Benjamin Tallmadge*, prepared by himself, at the request of his Children; Dawson's *Battles of the United States, by Sea and Land*; Stark's *Memoir and Official Correspondence of Gen. John Stark, with Notices of . . . and of Colonel Robert Rogers*; Greene's *The Life of Nathaniel Greene, Major-general in the Army of the Revolution*, Edit. New-York: 1867, Drake's *Life and Correspondence of Henry Knox, Major-general in the Revolutionary Army*; Jones's *History of New York during the Revolutionary War*, and de Lancey's *Notes* on that work; Bancroft's *History of the United States*, both the original and the centenary editions; Bolton's *History of Westchester-county*, both editions; Tarbox's *Life of Israel Putnam*; Carrington's *Battles of the American Revolution*; and Ridpath's *History of the United States*.

Those works, bearing on the subject, in the German language, which are in our own library, were put away, and could not be reached without undue labor; and we were not physically able to go elsewhere, to consult them. For those reasons, they have not been examined.

[1] Vide pages 262, 263, 264, ante.

[2] Vide pages 266–268, ante.

[3] *General Howe to Lord George Germaine*, "NEW-YORK, 30 November, "1776;" Stedman's *History of the American War*, i., 215; [Hall's] *History of the Civil War in America*, i., 209; etc.

[4] Stedman's *History of the American War*, i., 215.

[5] *Memoirs of Major-general Heath*, 78.

[6] Vide page 252, ante.

[7] Ibid.

[8] In the *Return of the Killed, Wounded, and Missing, of the Royal Army*, appended to General Howe's despatch to Lord George Germaine, dated "NEW-YORK, 3 December, 1776," it was stated that the only one of either of the two Regiments of the Light Dragoons then in America, who was killed, from the nineteenth to the twenty-eighth of October, inclusive, was one Rank and File, of the Seventeenth Regiment; and, very probably, that one was the same to whom we have referred, in the text.

[9] *Memoirs of Major-general Heath*, 78.

[10] *General Howe to Lord George Germaine*, "NEW-YORK, 30 November, "1776."

[11] David How's *Diary*, October 29 and 30, 1776.

See, also, *Lieutenant-colonel Tilghman to his father*, "WHITE PLAINS, 31 "October, 1776"; *Memoirs of Major-general Heath*, 79; etc.

the interval had been undoubtedly occupied by the Americans, in industriously strengthening their position, they could scarcely have made defensible and formidable what, only a few hours previous, had been hardly respectable. Indeed, at no time, even under the most favorable circumstances, were the defences of the American lines, immediately above the Plains, in any respect formidable; and the center, where the post-road passed through them, was decidedly the weakest portion. They had been hastily constructed, without the superintendence of experienced Engineers. The stony soil prevented the ditch from being made of any troublesome depth or the parapet of a troublesome height: the latter was not fraised: only where it was least needed—probably because the construction of it, elsewhere, had been interfered with—was there the slightest appearance of an abatis.[1] There was little foundation, therefore, for General Howe's transparent excuses; and it would have been more creditable to his candor, had he told the true reason for his failure to assault the lines, on the morning after the Battle and while the troops who had been designated to make the assault, with their line unbroken, were resting on their arms, within a mile and in open sight from the works which they were expecting to assault, and ready to move against them, at a moment's notice—the fact was simply this, as we have already seen,[2] "the Army could no longer expediently attempt "anything against the enemy's" [*the Americans'*] "main body;" and it was necessary that it should be reinforced, before the Americans should be attacked.

During Tuesday, the twenty-ninth of October, as we have seen, the Royal Army, "with very little al-"teration" in its position, encamped on the Plain, and awaited the arrival of reinforcements;[3] and, notwithstanding the loss of Chatterton's-hill, in the opinion of some of the American Officers,[4] had made it necessary for the American Army to abandon the position, the work of strengthening its lines was continued, with unabated industry.[5]

During Wednesday, the thirtieth of October, the King's troops were occupied in throwing up some defensive works and redoubts, on the Plain, in front of the American lines,[6] and an entrenchment on the summit of Chatterton's-hill;[7] and, during the afternoon of the same day, four Regiments, from the lines on New-York-island,[8] and two Regiments of the Sixth Brigade, who had been posted at Mamaroneck, after the Queen's Rangers had been so "roughly

[1] In this description of the character of the American defenses, we have followed Stedman, (*History of the American War*, i., 213,) who was probably present, in the Royal Army.

We are not insensible that Bancroft, (*History of the United States*, original edition, ix., 180; the same, centenary edition, v., 444,) has so framed his sentence that his readers must suppose the abatis was as extended as the "lines of entrenchments;" but the feebleness of the Army and the scarcity of teams could not have secured so great a work, in so short a time; neither General Washington nor General Heath nor General Knox, among the Americans, nor General Howe nor General Lord Cornwallis, among the King's troops, all of whom have more or less described the American defenses, has made the slightest allusion to such a general defense, before the long line of American entrenchments; and Stedman expressly stated that "the point of the hill, on the enemy's "right," [*that on the line of the Harlem Railroad, immediately northward from the Railroad station,*] "exceedingly steep and rocky, was covered by "a strong abatis in front of the entrenchment," the very place, as we have said in the text, where such an additional mean of defense was least needed. For these reasons, we prefer to believe that the American lines were not, generally, furnished with an abatis.

[2] Vide page 272, ante.

[3] *General Howe to Lord George Germaine*, "NEW-YORK, 30 November, "1776."

[4] General Heath said, (*Memoirs*, 79,) "the British having got posses-"sion of this hill, it gave them a vast advantage of the American lines, "almost down to the center;" and General Knox, in a letter to his brother, dated "NEAR WHITE-PLAINS, 32 MILES FROM NEW-YORK, 1 "Nov: 1776," said "the enemy's having possession of this hill obliged "us to abandon some slight lines thrown up on the White Plains."

[5] There was something which required explanation in what was written by General Washington's Secretary and, undoubtedly, with his approval, to the President of the Congress, when he said, "Our post, from "its situation, is not so advantageous as could be wished; and was only "intended as temporary and occasional, till the Stores belonging to the "Army, which had been deposited, here, could be removed."—(*Colonel Robert H. Harrison to the President of the Congress*, "WHITE-PLAINS, 29 "October, 1776."

"The Stores belonging to the Army," at that time and for some time previous, had not been so abundant as to have been burdensome; and, if there had been judicious oversight, they could have been carried a couple of miles further, to a place of greater safety, when they were carried to the White Plains, saving the repeated re-handling of them and the construction of two distinct lines of works for nothing else than for the "temporary and occasional" protection of them.

There is, generally, a prodigality in the expenditure of both money and materials and labor, in all which relates to Armies; but there seems to have been an excess of prodigality in the use of all these, of which the American Army had such an insufficient supply, if the only purpose of the two lines of entrenchments, one at the foot and the other on the crest of the high grounds, at the White Plains, had been only for the "temporary and occasional" protection of a few Stores, handled and re-handled, over and over again, the whole of which could have been consumed by the Army, in less than six days, probably in half that time.*

If there had been, in fact, no other reason than these, for occupying and fortifying that position, there was reason for General George Clinton's doubts, when he wrote, "Uncovered, as we are; daily on fatigue; "making redoubts, fléches, abatis, and lines; and retreating from "them and the little temporary huts made for our comfort, before they "are well finished, I fear, will ultimately destroy our Army, without "fighting." . . . "However, I would not be understood to con-"demn measures. They may be right, for aught I know. I do not un-"derstand much of the refined art of War: it is said to consist of "stratagem and deception."—(*General George Clinton to John McKesson*, "CAMP NEAR THE WHITE PLAINS, October 31, 1776.")

[6] *Colonel Robert H. Harrison to the President of the Congress*, "WHITE-"PLAINS, October 31, 1776;" *Letter from a Gentleman in the Army*, dated "CAMP NEAR THE MILLS, ABOUT THREE MILES NORTH OF THE WHITE-"PLAINS, November 1, 1776," published in *The Pennsylvania Evening Post*, Vol. II., No. 250, PHILADELPHIA, Thursday, November 14, 1776; *Memoirs of General Heath*, 80; etc.

[7] *Lieutenant-colonel Gist to the Maryland Council of Safety*, "CAMP "BEFORE THE WHITE-PLAINS, 2 November, 1776."

[8] Vide page 230, ante.

* "His," [*General Washington's*,] "apprehensions are exceedingly "great lest the Army should suffer much for want of necessary supplies "of Provisions, especially in the article of Flour. From the best in-"telligence, he is able to obtain, there is not more in Camp and at the "several places where it has been deposited, than will serve the Army "longer than four or five days, provided the utmost care and economy "were used in issuing it out; but, from the waste and embezzlement, "for want of proper attention to it, as it is reported to him, it is not "probable that it will last so long."—(*Colonel Robert H. Harrison to Colonel Joseph Trumbull*, Commissary-general of Provisions, "WHITE-"PLAINS, November 1, 1776.")

"handled" by the Americans,[1] joined the main body of the Army, on the Plain, for the reinforcement of it.[2]

During the same day, [*Wednesday, October* 30,] the Americans were not idle—they probably kept up an appearance of continuing their labor in strengthening their works, while they were, also, preparing for an abandonment of them;[3] but no official record has come down to us, concerning their doings, on that day.

Having been strengthened by the addition of six fresh and effective Regiments to his already powerful command, General Howe determined to attack the American lines, on the following day, [*Thursday, October* 31;] and, for that purpose, all necessary preparations were duly made; but the preceding night and the morning of that day were very rainy; and the proposed movement was necessarily postponed.[4]

During the same day, [*Thursday, October* 31,] the Americans remained within their works, quietly preparing for the abandonment of them and carefully watching every movement of their enemy.

Supposing that one of the objects of General Howe was to turn the flank of the lines; to seize the bridge over the Croton-river; and, thereby, to cut off the communication of the Army with the upper country, General Washington detached General Rezin Beall, with three fine Regiments of Marylanders, to occupy that very important pass; and General Lord Stirling was ordered, with the Brigade which he commanded, "to keep pace with the enemy's left flank, and to "push up, also, to Croton-river, should he plainly "perceive that the enemy's route lays that way."[5] At the same time that the Army was being rapidly diminished by the desertions of the Militia,[6] to say nothing of stragglers,[7] those who remained at their post were evidently diligently employed in preparing to move to a new position—an operation in which, the great scarcity of teams added, very greatly, to the personal labor of the men[8]—and, during the following night, that of Thursday, the thirty-first of October,[9] the entire line of the Army, taking the extreme left of the line for the pivot,[10] swung back, from the lines which it had constructed, with so much labor, on the high grounds, above the Plains, until its rear rested on the more advantageous high grounds of Northeastle;[11] within a mile from the position which it had abandoned;[12] and authoritatively described as "grounds which were strong and advantageous, and "such as they," [*the King's troops*,] "could not have "gained without much loss of blood, in case an "attempt had been made."[13]

A strong party was left in possession of the lines

[1] Vide page 253, ante.

[2] *General Howe to Lord George Germaine*, "NEW-YORK, 30 November, "1776;" [Hall's] *History of the Civil War in America*, i., 209; Stedman's *History of the American War*, i., 215; etc.

[3] How's *Diary*, October 30; *Letter from Lieutenant colonel Tilghman to his father*, "WHITE-PLAINS, 31 October, 1776."

[4] *General Howe to Lord George Germaine*, "NEW YORK, 30 November, "1776;" [Hall's] *History of the Civil War in America*, i., 209; Stedman's *History of the American War*, i., 215; etc.

[5] *Lieutenant colonel Tilghman to William Duer*, "WHITE-PLAINS, October 31, 1776."

[6] "Our Army is decreasing, fast: several gentlemen who have come "to Camp, within a few days, have observed large numbers of Militia "returning home, on the different roads."—(*Colonel Robert H. Harrison to the President of the Congress*, "WHITE-PLAINS, October 31, 1776.")

"It" [*a reinforcement*,] "will arrive, very seasonably, and in part "make up for the deficiency occasioned by daily desertions of our men, "who are returning to their homes in the most scandalous and infamous "manner. The roads are crowded with them."—(*Colonel Robert H. Harrison to Governor Trumbull*, "WHITE-PLAINS, November 2, 1776.")

[7] "The General, in a ride he took, yesterday, to reconnoitre the "grounds about this, was surprised and shocked to find both Officers "and Soldiers straggling all over the country, under one idle pretence "or other, when they cannot tell the hour or minute the Camp may be "attacked, and their services indispensably necessary. He once more "positively orders that neither Officer or Soldier shall stir out of Camp, "without leave: . . ." (*General Orders*, "HEAD-QUARTERS, WHITE "PLAINS, October 31, 1776.")

[8] *Colonel Robert H. Harrison to the President of the Congress*, "WHITE-"PLAINS, October 31, 1776."

[9] Chief justice Marshall, (*Life of George Washington*, ii., 505,) stated, in harmony with what General Howe also stated in his despatches to Lord George Germaine, (*vide page* 272, *ante*,) that the American Army was withdrawn from the lines on the night after the engagement on Chatterton's-hill; and that it was moved, a second time, during the night of the thirty first of October, to the high grounds of Northeastle, which he erroneously supposed to have been five miles from the White Plains.

We cannot reconcile either of these statements, without some qualification, with well-known facts which indicate, beyond a peradventure, that the lines which the main body had occupied, from the beginning, were fully occupied until the evening of the thirty-first of October, as stated in the text; and we await the appearance of new evidence which can throw more light on the subject, without permitting our own well-considered convictions to be, in the meantime, disturbed by what appears to have been written ambiguously.

[10] "The left of our General's Division was not to move; but the re-"mainder of his Division and all the other Divisions of the Army "were to fall back and form," on that stationery pivot, (*Memoirs of General Heath*, 79;) the whole occupying a new line, without having disturbed the relative positions of any of the Regiments or Divisions of whom the Army was composed.

[11] Gordon's *History of the American Revolution*, ii., 343, 344; Marshall's *Life of George Washington*, ii., 506; *General Howe to Lord George Germaine*, "NEW-YORK, 30 November, 1776;" [Hall's] *History of the Civil War in America*, i., 210; Stedman's *History of the American War*, i., 216; etc.

[12] Hall and Stedman erroneously supposed the new position was North of the Croton-river. General Howe, very accurately, stated it was "one "mile back from their entrenchments." Chief justice Marshall, as we have seen, erroneously supposed it was five miles from the White Plains. Hildreth, (*History of the United States*, iii., 154,) said it was two miles in the rear of the first line. Irving, (*Life of George Washington*, ii., 397,) said it was five miles distant. Lossing, (*Pictorial Field-book of the Revolution*, ii., 823,) said uncertainly, it was "toward the Croton River." General Knox, in a letter written to his brother, dated "NEAR WHITE-"PLAINS, 32 MILES FROM NEW-YORK, 1 Nov. 1776," said "the enemy's "possession of this hill obliged us to abandon some slight lines thrown "up on the White Plains. This we did, this morning, and retired to "some hills about half a mile in the rear."

As the left of the former line did not move from the position which it had occupied since the twenty-second of October; and because the remainder of the Army, without disturbing the formation of the line, did no more than to swing back, on a pivot, into its new position, the extreme right could not have been more than two miles distant from the former line, probably it was not much more than half that distance.

[13] *General Washington to the President of the Congress*, "WHITE-PLAINS, "6 November, 1776."

See, also, Gordon's *History of the American Revolution*, ii., 344; Marshall's *Life of George Washington*, ii., 506; [Hall's] *History of the Civil War in America*, i., 210; Stedman's *History of the American War*, i., 216; etc.

which had been vacated:[1] and, during the night, it set fire to several barns and one house, which contained forage; and some Provisions which, for the want of teams, could not be removed, were also destroyed.[2]

On the morning after the withdrawal of the main body of the American Army from its lines, at the head of the White Plains, [*Friday, November* 1, 1776,] General Howe gave orders for the occupation of those lines, by the Royal Army; but, again, a violent rain interposed; and the project was abandoned.[3] At a later hour, however, the Hessian Grenadiers were moved from Chatterton's-hill, and occupied those lines,[4] very possibly as the beginning of a movement against the new position of the American Army, which, after a due examination of its strength, was conducted no further.[5]

On the morning of Friday, the first of November, simultaneously with the movement of the Hessian Grenadiers and with other equally important preparations—the whole, we believe, preparatory to an assault on the new position of the American Army, in the high grounds of North Castle,—a heavy body, from the Right of the Royal Army, with a number of field-pieces, was moved against the extreme left of the American lines, where the Division commanded by General Heath was posted, and opened a heavy fire; which was returned by Captain-lieutenant Bryant and Lieutenant Jackson, of the American Artillery, neither party sustaining any loss which was particularly worthy of record.[6] A violent rain, however, again interposed; and the project, whatever it may have been, was abandoned.[7]

---

[1] *Letter from a Gentleman in the Army*, "CAMP NEAR THE MILLS, ABOUT "THREE MILES NORTH OF THE WHITE-PLAINS, November 1, 1776," published in *The Pennsylvania Evening Post, No.* 280, PHILADELPHIA, Thursday, November 14, 1776; *General Howe to Lord George Germaine*, "NEW-"YORK, 30 November, 1776;" [Hall's] *History of the Civil War in America*, i., 210; Gordon's *History of the American Revolution*, ii., 344; etc.

[2] *Memoirs of General Heath*, 80.

See, also, a *Letter from a Gentleman in the Army*, dated "CAMP NEAR "THE MILLS, ABOUT THREE MILES NORTH OF THE WHITE-PLAINS, November 1, 1776," published in *The Pennsylvania Evening Post*, No. 280, PHILADELPHIA, Thursday, November 14, 1776; *General George Clinton to John McKesson*, "CAMP AT THE OLD PLACE, NEAR THE WHITE PLAINS, 2 "November, 1776;" *General Howe to Lord George Germaine*, "NEW-"YORK, 30 November, 1776;" etc.

General Howe and several others have fallen into the error of supposing that the Village of the White-Plains was also burned, on the occasion now under notice: it was not burned until the night of the fifth of November, when, after he had robbed the houses, it was destroyed by a party of Massachusetts troops, commanded by Major Austin.

[3] In the cross-examination of General Lord Cornwallis, by the members of a Committee of the House of Commons, on the sixth of May, 1779, his Lordship was asked, "Was there not a time, at the White "Plains, when our Army lay on their arms, intending to attack the "enemy, but were prevented by rain?," to which he replied, "After "the enemy fell back to the heights, near North-Castle, they left an "advance Corps on the heights of the White Plains; there were or-"ders given for an attack of that Corps, which was prevented by a vi-"olent rain. We did not lay upon our arms." The inquiry was continued by the Committee asking, "From the situation of the rebel "Army and of our's, was that storm in their or our faces?" to which his Lordship replied, "I do not apprehend that the attack was pre-"vented by the storm of rain being in either of our faces; there are "other effects of a storm, such as spoiling the roads and preventing "the drawing of artillery up steep hills." The Committee continued, by asking, "Whether if the powder was wet, on both sides, the at-"tack could not not have been made by bayonets?;" to which his Lordship replied, "I do not recollect that I said the powder was wet;" and, there, the subject was dropped.—(Almon's *Parliamentary Register*, Fifth Session of the Fourteenth Parliament of Great Britain, xxii., 11.)

[4] *General Howe to Lord George Germaine*, "NEW-YORK, 30 November, "1776."

[5] Although it was not stated, at the time, and notwithstanding it has not been stated, since that time, that General Howe proposed to attack the Americans, in their new position, on the morning after it was taken by them, we are sure that that was his purpose, when he ordered the Hessian Grenadiers from Chatterton's-hill; and made the preparations for "drawing of artillery up steep hills," to which General Lord Cornwallis referred, in his testimony; and ordered or appgoved the movement on the extreme left of the American lines, of which mention will be made, hereafter. Nothing else than such a project, it seems to us, could have warranted all these operations; and, certainly, nothing else could have led some of the British writers, including Captain Hall, (*History of the Civil War in America*, i., 210,) to consider the occupation of the abandoned lines, by the Hessian Grenadiers, as a pursuit of the fugitive Americans.

[6] General Heath has left a very minute description of the movements of the enemy and of his own preparations to oppose those movements, (*Memoirs of General Heath*, 80, 81;) and we make room for it, because of its great local interest, in the vicinity of the White Plains: "Our Gen-"eral's first anxiety," General Heath stated, speaking of himself, "was "for Colonel Malcolm's Regiment, on the hill, to the East of the hollow, "on the left,* lest the enemy should push a Column into the hollow, "and cut the Regiment off from the Division. He, therefore, ordered "Major Keith, one of his Aides, to gallop over, and order Colonel Mal-"colm to come off, immediately, with Lieutenant Fenno's Artillery, but, "upon a more critical view of the ground, in the hollow, (at the head "of which there was a heavy stone wall, well-situated to cover a body of "troops to throw a heavy fire directly down it, while an oblique fire "could be thrown in, on both sides,) he ordered Major Pollard, his other "Aide, to gallop after Keith, and countermand the first order; and to "direct the Colonel to remain at his post; and he should be supported. "A strong Regiment was ordered to the head of the hollow, to occupy "the wall.

"The cannonade was brisk, on both sides, through which the two "Aides-de-camp passed, in going and returning. At this instant, Gen-"eral Washington rode up to the hill. His first question to our General, "was, 'How is your Division?' He was answered, 'They are all in or-"der.' 'Have you,' said the Commander-in-chief, 'any troops on the hill, "over the hollow?' He was answered, 'Malcolm's Regiment is there.' 'If "you do not call them off, immediately,' says the General, 'you may lose "them; if the enemy push a column up the hollow.' He was answered, "that, even in that case, their retreat should be made safe; that a strong "Regiment was posted at the head of the hollow, behind the wall; that "this Regiment, with the oblique fire of the Division, would so check the "enemy, as to allow Malcolm to make a safe retreat. The Commander-"in-chief concluded by saying, 'Take care that you do not lose them.'

"The Artillery of the Division was so well directed as to throw the "British artillery-men, several times, into confusion; and, finding that "they could not, here, make any impression, they drew back their pieces, "the Column not advancing." [*probably because of the failure of the main body to advance against the American lines, in conjunction with this detachment, as we have already stated.*]

"The British Artillery now made a circuitous movement; and came "down, toward the American right. Here, unknown to them, were "some twelve-pounders, upon the discharge of which, they made off, "with their field pieces, as fast as their horses could draw them.

"A shot from the American cannon, at this place, took off the head of a "Hessian artillery-man: they also left one of their artillery-horses, dead "on the field. What other loss they sustained, was not known. Of our "General's Division, one man, only, belonging to Colonel Paulding's "Regiment of New-York troops, was killed." †

[7] *Testimony of Lord Cornwallis, before a Committee of the House of Commons*, vide Note 3, of this page, ante.

---

* For descriptions of the various localities mentioned in this statement, by General Heath, see page 252, ante.

† The *Returns of General George Clinton's Brigade*, dated "PEEKSKILL, "November 17, 1776," noted that casualty, and gave the name of the man—William Phœnix, of Captain Cadmus's Company.

Having been thus frustrated in all his efforts to cut off the communications of the American Army with the upper country as well as with New England and to draw General Washington to give him battle, in a general engagement—in other words, having been completely outgeneraled by the Commander-in-chief of the forces whom his associates in arms had so contemptuously ridiculed—General Howe determined to abandon the attempt;[1] and to withdraw his great and powerful command from Westchester-county, in search of laurels on other and more inviting fields. The two Armies continued in their respective lines, not more than a long cannon-shot from each other,[2] until the following Saturday night, [*November* 2,] when the American sentries heard what they supposed to have been the rumbling sound of moving artillery.[3] On Monday night, the fourth of November, however, the entire encampment of the enemy was broken up; and, on the following morning, [*Tuesday, November* 5,] he made a sudden and unexpected movement from all the posts, in front of the American lines, which he had previously taken[4]—as early as the preceding Monday, [*October* 28,] evidently preparatory to this movement, General Knyphausen, who had been left at New Rochelle, with the Second Division of the German troops, to keep open the communication between the Army and the Fleet,[5] had been ordered to leave the Regiment of Waldeckers, who formed a portion of his command, at that place, and to move with the remainder of the Division, six fresh Battalions of Hessians, towards Kingsbridge; and, on Saturday, the second of November, he had occupied a position, on New-York-island, near that place: on Sunday, the third of November, the entire Army had been ordered to provide itself with forage, for three day's consumption: on the following day, [*Monday, November* 4,] Major-general Grant, with the Fourth Brigade of British troops, had been moved down to Mile-Square and Valentine's-hill; General Agnew, with the Sixth Brigade of British troops, the same who had been moved to Mamaroneck, on the morning after the Queen's Rangers had been so "roughly handled" by Colonel Haslet and his command,[6] had been moved from that place to a bridge over the Bronx-river, near De Lancey's Mill, [*now village of West Farms,*] in the Town of Westchester; and the Waldeckers whom General Knyphausen had left at New Rochelle, on the preceding Monday, was moved to another bridge, also over the Bronx-river, three miles above the other, [*then and now known as Williams's-bridge:*] and every other necessary preparation for an orderly and undisturbed retreat had, in the meanwhile, been taken.[7]

During the evening of Tuesday, the fifth of November, inspired by the teachings of General Israel Putnam,[8] and in harmony with the advanced New England ideas, of that period, with which the inhabitants of Westchester-county had already become well-acquainted,[9] as well as with those of an immediately subsequent period,[10] a body of Massachusetts troops, led by Major Austin, of Colonel Brewer's Regiment, left the Camp, and went down into the Village of the White Plains, which the enemy has abandoned, during the earlier portions of the day. The purposes of that party were such as New Englanders of that period were apt to regard as peculiarly "patriotic"—they evidently went down to see what the merciless Hessian and British soldiery had left, when the Royal Army had retreated; to select, for their own or their families' uses, and to carry away, into New England, whatever, of that remainder, should best suit their own tastes; to dispossess the women and children who were mostly the occupants of the houses; and to burn what they did not care to steal, sparing almost nothing of either public or private properties, just to "strike terrour into the Tories and influence in our "favour," as these New England thieves "patriotically" expressed it. That was the prevailing New England idea of the period, taught and illustrated by

[1] "I did not think the driving their rear-guard further back, an object "of the least consequence," were General Howe's official words, descriptive of that very important determination

See, also, [Hall's] *History of the Civil War in America*, i., 211; Stedman's *History of the American War*, i., 216; *Memoirs of General Heath*, 81; Gordon's *History of the American Revolution*, ii., 314; Marshall's *Life of George Washington*, ii., 506, 507; etc.

[2] *Memoirs of General Heath*, 81-83; *Letter dated* "NEAR HEAD-QUARTERS, NORTH-CASTLE, Nov. 5, 1776," published in *The Freeman's Journal and New-Hampshire Gazette*, Vol. I., No. 26, PORTSMOUTH, Tuesday, November 19, 1776.

[3] *Memoirs of General Heath*, 83.

[4] *General Washington to the President of the Congress*, "WHITE-PLAINS, 6 "November, 1776;" *the same to Governor Livingston*, "WHITE-PLAINS, "7 November, 1776;" *Memoirs of General Heath*, 83; Marshall's *Life of George Washington*, ii., 507; Gordon's *History of the American Revolution*, ii., 344; etc.

[5] Vide pages 253, 258, ante.

[6] Vide pages 252, 253, ante.

[7] *General Howe to Lord George Germaine*, "NEW-YORK, 30 November "1776;" [Hall's] *History of the Civil War in America*, i., 211; etc.

[8] "The question being asked Major Austin, whether he had any "orders for burning said houses, he confessed that he had no orders "for it; but he alleged, as an excuse, his being in company with "some of the General Officers, just before the houses were burnt on the "Plains," [*those containing the forage, etc., which had been burned when the Army evacuated the lines, on the evening of the thirty first of October,*] "and heard General Putnam say he thought it would be best to burn "ALL the houses, etc.; and finding there was houses burnt on the "Plains, soon after, he thought it his duty to burn the said houses, "as he did."—(*Deposition of Major Austin, before the Court-martial*, "PEEKSKILL, November 12, 1776.")

[9] The reader will remember the unauthorized raids of the banditti, under Isaac Sears, David Waterbury, David Wooster, and other "patriotic" New Englanders, during which the most barefaced robberies of the farmers' properties, throughout Westchester-county, had been perpetrated by large bodies of armed men, from Connecticut, against whom the isolated and unarmed farmers had been powerless.

[10] "The enemy have retreated from the White Plains. It was a happy "thought, the burning of a few houses, upon our retreat from thence. "The measure convinced them they had little to expect from penetrating the country. They saw how much we would sacrifice," [*of the property of others,*] "to the safety of our Army and disadvantage of "theirs; at the same time, it must have struck terrour into the Tories "and influence in our favour, from the strong motive of interest, as "they perceive their dwellings, etc., depend on our success."—(*Colonel Jed. Huntington to Governor Trumbull*, "CAMP, NORTH-CASTLE, 7th No-"vember, 1776.")

New Englanders of the most elevated stations: and it was evidently regarded, by the New England Major and his "Christian" followers, not only a duty but a virtue, to obey the teachings of such "patriotic" and "virtuous" preceptors.

The Major and his men entered house after house, as they went down the roadways leading through the Village; carrying from each, such articles as pleased their cupidity;[1] hastening the occupants from the houses, without suffering them to dress the children, where there were children, "but drove them out of "doors, naked;"[2] carrying the sick and helpless, out-doors, on their beds, and leaving them exposed to the rigors of that November night;[3] insulting the females,[4] with ill language and threats, in the presence of the Major; and, then, setting fire to the houses.[5] The Court-house, the Meeting-house of the Presbyterian-church, and the greater number of the dwellings, including that of Doctor Graham,[6] together with all, of furniture and provisions and clothing, which the rapacious enemy had spared for the use and support and protection of the helpless inhabitants, unless such portions of each, which the new-comers had taken away, to the Major's marquee or elsewhere, were thus wantonly and criminally destroyed.[7]

That great outrage, inflicted on the inhabitants of Westchester-county, called forth the denunciations of the Commander-in-chief, in the General Orders of the Army,[8] and those of the Committee of Safety of the State;[9] the leader of the band of ruffians who had inflicted the great wrong, only after the most vigorous effort of General Lee, was mildly "dis-"missed from the service," by the verdict of a second Court-martial, who sat in judgment, on the culprit;[10] and he was turned over to the Convention of the State, to be dealt with, in an action by the State, resulting in his escape from the Jail at Kingston, which closed the subject, on the pages of history.

On Wednesday, the sixth of November, General Howe, with that portion of the Royal Army whom he had not pushed forward toward Kingsbridge, encamped at Dobbs's-ferry;[11] and, on the same day, General Washington called a Council of his General Officers, to consult on such measures as should be adopted, in case the enemy should continue to fall back, on the City of New York.[12]

On Thursday, the seventh of November, the enemy's park of Artillery was moved to Kingsbridge, under a strong escort, with a detachment of Chasseurs, to join the Division commanded by General Knyphausen;[13] and his foraging parties were busily employed in collecting Grain and Hay, and in driving in Cattle, from all those portions of the County which were below Tarrytown, the Plains, and Rye.[14]

On Friday, the eighth of November, two Battalions of Light Infantry and the remainder of the Chasseurs, with four field-pieces, took post on the line of communication with Kingsbridge;[15] and, on the part of the Americans, the troops belonging to New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and the more Southern States, began to file off, from the lines which were occupied by the American Army, "as fast as our situation and circum-"stances would admit, in order to be transported over "the river, with all expedition."[16]

On Saturday, the ninth of November, the Division commanded by General Heath, who had performed so distinguished a part in the military operations, in Westchester-county, was moved from the extreme left

---

[1] "When she went out of the house, some of the men began to carry "things out of the house; when she asked them why they took those "things. Then Major Austin spake; and told her he should carry "them to the General's; and alleged General Sullivan's orders for it." —(*Mrs. Adams's testimony, before the Court-martial for the trial of Major Austin*, "PHILIPSBURG, November 12, 1776.")

"On the night of the 5th instant, he had been out on a scouting party, "with Major Austin; and, on their return, the Major ordered him back, with "five men, to the houses which they burned; and told him to take good care "of whatever things he got; to keep them safe; and bring them off, to his "markee;" etc.—(*Testimony of Sergeant Churchill*, at the same trial, "November 13," in which Captain Keith and James Linzer fully concurred.)

"Further says, that what things were tied up, in two blankets, were "carried to the Major's markee; and all the rest were left with the wo-"men."—(*Testimony of Tilley How*, at the same trial, "November 13;" in which James Linzer and Captain Keith fully concurred.)

[2] *Testimony of Mrs. Adams*, at the same trial.

[3] *Testimony of Tilley How, and of James Linzer, and of Captain Keith*, at same trial.

[4] *Testimony of Mrs. Adams*, at the same trial.

[5] "Major Austin told his men to go and set the other houses on fire, "as quick as he could."—(*Testimony of Mrs. Adams*, at the same trial.)

See, also, the testimony, on the same subject, of Sergeant Churchill, of Tilley How, of James Linzer, and of Captain Keith, at the same trial.

[6] Understood, from aged people, many years since, to have occupied the lower portion of the property now occupied by the respected widow of the late C. Hedsey Mitchell—that portion of that property, indeed, which was occupied, so many years, for the Law-offices of Minott Mitchell, Esq., so long the head of the Bar of Westchester-county.

[7] *General Orders of the Army*, "HEAD-QUARTERS, WHITE-PLAINS, No-"vember 6, 1776;" *The Committee of Safety for the State of New-York to the President of the Congress*, "IN COMMITTEE OF SAFETY FOR THE STATE "OF NEW-YORK, FISHKILL, November 28, 1776;" *Memoirs of General Heath*, 84; etc.

[8] *General Orders of the Army*, "HEAD-QUARTERS, WHITE-PLAINS, No-"vember 6, 1776."

[9] *Committee of Safety for the State of New-York to the President of the Congress*, "IN COMMITTEE OF SAFETY, FOR THE STATE OF NEW YORK, "FISHKILL, November 28, 1776."

[10] *Report of the General Court-martial, held by order of Major-general Lee, for the trial of Major Austin*, "PHILIPSBURG, November 12, 1776."

[11] *General Howe to Lord George Germaine*, "NEW-YORK, 30 November, "1776;" [Hall's] *History of the Civil War in America*, i., 211, 212; etc.

[12] *General Washington to the President of the Congress*, "WHITE-PLAINS, "6 November, 1776."

The Council referred to agreed, unanimously, that, in case the enemy was really retreating towards New York, it would be proper, immediately, to throw a body of troops, into New Jersey; that those troops who were from the States to the westward of the Hudson, should be thus detached, the others to be subject to "the movements of the enemy and "the circumstances of the American Army;" and that three thousand men should be detailed to take post at Peekskill and the passes in the Highlands, for the defence of those posts, for erecting fortifications, etc.

[13] *General Howe to Lord George Germaine*, "NEW-YORK, 30 November, "1776."

[14] *General McDougal to Colonel DeWitt*, "WHITE-PLAINS, November 7, "1776;" *Memoirs of General Heath*, 84.

[15] *General Howe to Lord George Germaine*, "NEW-YORK, 30 November, "1776."

[16] *General Washington to General Greene*, "HEAD-QUARTERS, 8 November, "1776."

of the line, which it had so honorably occupied; and took up its line of march, towards Peekskill, where it was to be permanently posted, for the defense of the Highlands;[1] and, on Sunday, the tenth of November, General Washington left the White Plains, to take command of those troops who had crossed the Hudson-river, and who, soon afterwards, were engaged in that disastrous retreat, through the Jerseys, and in that subsequent recovery of the greater part of that State, which so greatly distinguished him, as a commanding General, and which have been recorded, with such entire approbation, on the pages of history.[2] General Lee was left at the White Plains, with his own Division and those commanded by Generals Spencer and Sullivan, generally New York and New England troops, with orders to watch the movements of the enemy; to secure and carry off the Stores; and, then, to follow the main body of the Army, into the Jerseys.[3]

While General Washington and the main body of the American Army were thus falling back from their position, at North Castle, General Howe and the main body of the Royal Army continued to fall back and approach Kingsbridge. On Sunday, the tenth of November, a Brigade of Hessians was moved to that place, to increase the strength of General Knyphausen's already strong Division;[4] and, two days afterwards, [*Tuesday, November* 12,] the main body of the Royal Army broke up the encampment, at Dobbs's-ferry, which it had occupied since the preceding Wednesday, and, in two columns, moved towards Kingsbridge, resting, on the following day, [*Wednesday, November* 13,] on the heights of Fordham, and forming a line, with the Right upon the road leading to the Borough Town of Westchester, and covered by the Bronx-river, and with the Left on the Hudson-river,[5] where it remained, until the preparations for the assault on Fort Washington, which had been reasonably determined on, had been completed.[6]

The progress of the Royal Army through Westchester-county was distinguished by the outrages which were inflicted on the inhabitants, without respect to persons or sexes, on both those who were entirely conservative and disposed to favor the Royal cause and those who were radically and actively opposed to it—as General Washington described them, while forewarning the Governor of New Jersey of what the fate of that people would be, "they have treated all, "here, without discrimination: the distinction of "Whig and Tory has been lost in one general scene "of ravage and desolation."[7] In that work, the Hessians and the British troops were equally notorious; and what the soldiery spared, was frequently carried away by the soldiers' wives and mistresses, who formed a part of the retinue of the Army.[8] Indeed, the warmth of controversy called out from one of the most prominent Loyalists of that period, the following graphic description of the outrages inflicted by the King's troops: "The inhuman treatment alluded to, "was the indiscriminate plunder suffered to be com-"mitted, by the soldiery under his command, on "Staten Island, Long Island, the White Plains, and "in the Province of New Jersey, where friend and "foe, loyalist and rebel, met with the same fate—a "series of continued plunder, which was a disgrace to "an Army pretending to discipline, and which, while "it tended to relax the discipline of the troops, could "not fail to create the greatest aversion, even in the "breast of loyalty itself, to a service which, under the "fair pretence of giving them protection, robbed them, "in many instances, of even the necessaries of life."[9]

But the sufferings endured by the inhabitants of Westchester-county were not confined to those which were produced by the outrages inflicted by the Royal Army and its followers. We have already alluded,[10] incidentally, to the robberies of Horses which were inflicted on the farmers of that County, by Officers of the American Army, for their private uses, at their respective homes—not by the Rank and File, nor by the soldiers' wives and concubines, nor in a foreign country; but by the Commissioned Officers of the Army of Americans who had been moved into the County, for the protection of the inhabitants and of their properties. To such an extent were those robberies of Horses, to be sent to the homes of the thieves, for their private uses, carried on, that, after several *General Orders*, bearing on the subject, had

[1] *Memoirs of General Heath*, 84.

[2] *General Washington to the President of the Congress*, "PEEKSKILL, 11 "November, 1776."

[3] *Instructions of General Washington to General Lee*, "HEAD-QUARTERS, "NEAR THE WHITE-PLAINS, 10 November, 1776;" *Return of the Continental Troops under the command of General Lee*, "NORTH-CASTLE, No-"vember 16, 1776;" *Memoirs of General Heath*, 84.

[4] *General Howe to Lord George Germaine*, "NEW-YORK, 30 November, "1776."

[5] *General Howe to Lord George Germaine*, "NEW-YORK, 30 November, "1776;" [Hall's] *History of the Civil War in America*, i., 212; etc.

[6] [Hall's] *History of the Civil War in America*, i., 212.

[7] *General Washington to Governor Livingston*, "WHITE-PLAINS, 7 No-"vember, 1776."

In a letter to General Greene, written on the same day, the General said, "They," [*the farmers, in New Jersey*,] "may rely upon it, that the "enemy will leave nothing they find among them; nor do they dis-"criminate between Whig and Tory. Woful experience has convinced "the latter, in the movements of the enemy, in this State, of this truth." —(*General Washington to General Greene*, "WHITE-PLAINS, November 7, "1776.")

[8] "The people who remained in that part of the country," [*Westchester-county*,] "through which they pass'd, have been most cruelly plun-"dered; many helpless women had even their shifts taken from their "backs by the soldiers' wives, after the great plunderers had done; and, "in this general ravage, no discrimination was made of Whig or Tory." (*Letter from Stamford*, dated "12th Nov. 1776," published in *The Freeman's Journal, or New-Hampshire Gazette*, Vol. I., No. 28, PORTSMOUTH, Tuesday, December 3, 1776.)

[9] [Galloway's] *Reply to the* Observations of Lieut. Gen. Sir William Howe on a pamphlet entitled *Letters to a Nobleman*, 17, 18.

On the general subject, see, also, *General McDougal to Colonel De Witt*, "WHITE-PLAINS, 7 November, 1776;" *Letter to a Gentleman in Virginia*, "HEAD-QUARTERS, WHITE-PLAINS, November 8, 1776," published in Force's *American Archives*, V., iii., 603; *The Committee of Safety to the President of the Congress*, "IN COMMITTEE OF SAFETY FOR THE "STATE OF NEW-YORK, FISHKILL, November 20, 1776;" etc.

[10] Vide pages 239, 240, ante.

been issued, without having checked the career of robbery, General Washington was constrained to issue another, in these words, sufficiently illustrative of the practices and of his views concerning them: "It is with astonishment the General hears that some "Officers have taken Horses, between the enemy's "Camp and ours, and sent them into the country, for "their private use. Can it be possible that per-"sons bearing Commissions and fighting in such "a cause, can degrade themselves into plunderers of "Horses? He hopes every Officer will set his face "against it, in future; and does insist that the "Colonels and commanding Officers of Regiments im-"mediately inquire into the matter, and report to him "who have been guilty of these practices; and that "they take an account of the Horses in their re-"spective encampments; and send to the Quarter-"master-general all that are not in some public "service."[1]

While some of the Officers of the American Army were thus employed in replenishing their own stables, at their respective homes, from the stables of the farmers of Westchester-county, others of that Army, Officers and Privates, were systematically visiting the houses of those farmers and robbing them of whatever was acceptable to them. Like the British and Hessians, they were not respecters of either the friends of the American cause or those of the King; nor did they hesitate to rob helpless and unprotected females and their families; sometimes turning them out of their houses, undressed and in their night-clothes; and, generally, adding personal abuse of their victims to the crime of robbing them. Nothing whatever was unacceptable to the thieves; and the bags of Feathers and of unmanufactured Wool, the Desks and Tea-tables and Chairs, the Book-cases and Books, the Andirons and brass and copper Kettles, the linen Curtains and Looking-glasses and women's Hats, the Churns and Washtubs, the sets of Sleigh-harness and skips of Bees, which appear recorded among the articles which were thus stolen by the soldiers whom Massachusetts and Connecticut had sent into the Army, very clearly indicated that while the Horses of the farmers of Westchester-county were stolen for the supplying of the stables of the thieves, at their respective homes, the Household Furniture belonging to the same farmers, and the Clothing of their wives, and their unmanufactured Wool and Feathers, and their Bees, were also stolen for the purpose of enriching the homes and the work-rooms and the gardens of those same "Christian" New Englanders, and the wardrobes of their families. Among those who were thus robbed were Miles Oakley, who was the Landlord of the Tavern, contiguous to the Court-house, in the Village of the White Plains;[2] John Martine, the grandfather of the late Caleb Martine of Greenburgh and of the widow of the late Thomas Dean of Tarrytown, whose homestead is now occupied by Isaac F. Van Wart, of Greenburgh; Talman Pugsley, who is said to have lived where the brick School-house now stands, opposite to the residence of Abraham Beare, of Greenburgh; Phebe Oakley, who was the sister-in-law of Talman Pugsley; Marmaduke Foster, who was the son-in-law of John Martine; and Solomon Pugsley and the widow Elizabeth Pugsley, whose places of residence are not known to us; and their Depositions and Statements and the Schedules of the articles stolen from John Martine and his son-in-law, afford, at once, the evidence of the robberies and of the comforts which were to be found in the homes of the quiet and industrious and intelligent residents of Westchester-county, at that time.[3] Among the thieves whose names have come down to us, were Major Bacon, Captains Gale, Shadlock, and Ford, and others, of Colonel Brewer's Regiment of Artificers, of the Massachusetts Line; and Officers and Privates of the Regiment of Connecticut troops, commanded by Colonel Charles Webb.[4]

In view of these great outrages, and of many others of which no records have been preserved, the Committee of Safety for the State addressed a letter to the President of the Continental Congress, in which are these concluding words: "I have the satisfaction "to assure you that the fortitude of this State and "their zeal for the glorious cause in which we are "engaged, is not abated; on the contrary, we are "prepared to meet even severer misfortunes, with a "spirit and firmness becoming the generous advo-

[1] *General Orders*, "HEAD-QUARTERS, WHITE-PLAINS, October 31, 1776."

[2] On page 68, ante, note 1, we referred to a Tavern, also contiguous to the Court-house, which, in April, 1775, was said to have been the meeting-place of Lewis Morris and his friends; to have been kept by Isaac Oakley; and to have stood until about 1868, when it was burned.

Unless there were two Taverns, in the White Plains, with Oakleys for their Landlords, in 1775 and 1776; or, unless Miles had succeeded Isaac, as the Landlord of the one Tavern which was "Oakley's "Tavern," between April, 1775, and November, 1776, we were probably in error, in our former statement, concerning the *name* of the Oakley who was the Landlord of that Tavern which was, there, mentioned: and if only one "Oakley's Tavern" was in existence, in the White Plains, at that time, it was among the buildings which were burned by Major Austin, on the fifth of November, 1776, (*vide pages* 276, 277, *ante*;) and, therefore, was not standing until 1868, as stated on page 68.

We have not been able to ascertain the facts; and so leave the matter in doubt.

[3] *Petition of Miles Oakley to General Washington*, "November 9, 1776;" *Deposition of John Martine* and *Memorandum of Goods plundered from him*, "dated November 13, 1776"; *Deposition of Talman Pugsley*, "dated "the second day of December, 1776"; *Petition of Phebe Oakley to the Convention of New-York*, and her *Deposition*, "dated the second of December, "1776"; *Deposition of Marmaduke Foster* and a *List of Articles taken by the soldiers, from him*, "dated the thirteenth of November, 1776"; *Release, by Stephen Oakley, "in behalf of Solomon Pugsley and the widow "Elizabeth Pugsley, to Captain Ford*, "for the things that said Captain "Ford and his men did take out of the house of Solomon Pugsley, near "the lines of the enemy, at White Plains, on Philips's Manor;" etc.

No more interesting papers, connected with the history of that period and illustrative of the morality and integrity of New Englanders of the era of the Revolutionary War, can be found, anywhere, than these.

[4] *Depositions of Phebe Oakley, John Martine, Talman Pugsley, and Marmaduke Foster; Release, by Stephen Oakley to Captain Ford; Deposition of Ebenezer Burrill*, "dated the second day of December, 1776"; etc.

"cates for Liberty. Unhappily am I to add, that, "amidst all our suffering, the Army employed for "the protection of America have not refrained from "embittering even the calamities of War. At a "time when the utmost resources of this State were "laid open to their wants, and the members of Con-"vention personally submitted to the labour and "fatigue which were necessary, on a sudden emer-"gency, and after frequent losses of Provisions and "Barracks, to supply two numerous Armies, aug-"mented by the Militia, with every article which "they required, the Court-house and the remains of "the Village, at the White Plains, which had been "spared, on the retreat of our forces, was, after the "enemy had, in their turn, retired, wantonly de-"stroyed, without the Orders and to the infinite re-"gret of our worthy General. Besides, in spite of "all his Excellency's efforts, wherever our troops "have marched or been stationed, they have done "infinite damage to the possessions and farms, and "have pilfered the property of the people.

"I am directed, Sir, to submit it to the honourable "Congress, whether some effectual remedy ought "not to be provided against such disorderly and dis-"graceful proceedings. The soldier who plunders "the country he is employed to protect, is no better "than a robber, and ought to be treated accordingly; "and a severe example ought, in the opinion of the "Committee, to be made of the Officer who, without "necessity or his General's permission, set fire to the "Court-house and other buildings, at the White "Plains. He is guilty of the crime of Arson; and if "he cannot be punished by the Articles of War, he "ought to be given up to the Laws of the land. If "so glaring a violation of every sentiment of human-"ity should be passed over, in silence, if the Army "is not seasonably restrained from such acts of bar-"barity, the consequence must be fatal to the cause "of a people whose exalted glory it is to be advocates "for the Rights of Mankind against the tyranny and "oppression of lawless power."[1]

The conduct of General Washington, in the trying events of that memorable Campaign, in Westchester-county, has received the unqualified approbation of his country and of the world, and secured for him the highest honors, as a Soldier and as a commanding General. The conduct of General Howe, during the same Campaign, received nothing else than the approval of the King, his step-brother, and that of the party of the Opposition, in the Parliament, of which he was a member, and which was, peculiarly, the party who was in sympathy with America.

Both the Admiral and the General, commanders, respectively, of the King's Fleet and Army, were accused, by the Press of Great Britain and in the Parliament, with want of wisdom, in the formation of their plans; and with want of vigor and energy, in the execution of those plans.[2] "A connection with "the Opposition, and a resolution, assumed before "their departure from England, to frustrate every "measure of the" [*then*] "present Administration, "and, thereby, to bring them" [*the Administration,*] "into disgrace with their Sovereign and the Nation," were, also, boldly charged on the two brothers;[3] while others "shrewdly suspected that their poverty, not "their will, consented"—they said that it was "ob-"vious to all, that, had the Admiral destroyed the "rebel ships, in their ports, or effectually blockaded "up their harbors, no valuable captures of Tobacco or "Indigo could have fallen to the share of the British "Admiral;" and they did not hesitate to assert that large fortunes were accumulated, from that source.[4] They also took advantage of the friendship which had existed between the family of Howe and the Americans, during the French War; and they boldly charged the brothers with positive friendship for the American cause.[5] All of these charges were, probably, more or less true. The two brothers were indolent men; fond of company, wine, and play: they were, in fact, identified with the party of the Opposition: they did not attempt to conceal the sympathy, which, to some extent, they felt for the Americans: like other Commanders, in both ancient and modern times, they probably kept a sharp eye on the spoils. But there were, also, other circumstances, of which their accusers knew nothing and of which the world, to-day, knows only very little, which largely controlled them; and it is only reasonable and fair, therefore, that the accused should, also, be heard on the subject—when a Committee of the House of Commons was charged with the grave duty of inquiring into the conduct of General Howe, during his command of the King's troops in North America, that distinguished Officer made a written defense, in which we find the following words, relative to the operations of the Royal Army, in Westchester-county:

"From the twelfth of October, the day the Army "landed on Frog's-neck, to the twenty-first of the "same month, we were employed in getting up Stores "and Provisions; and in bringing over the Dragoons, "the Second Division of Hessians, and the carriages "and horses for transportating Provisions, Artillery, "Ammunition, and Baggage. Four or five days had

[1] *The Committee of Safety to the President of the Congress.* "IN COMMIT-"TEE OF SAFETY FOR THE STATE OF NEW-YORK, FISHKILL, November "20, 1776."

[2] [Galloway's] *Letters to a Nobleman*, 36; [Galloway's] *Reply to the* Observations of Lieut. Gen. Sir William Howe, on a pamphlet, entitled *Letters to a Nobleman; Letter from "Cicero" to Lord Howe*, 2, 3; Wraxall's *Memoirs of his own Time*, Edit. Philadelphia: 1845, 163; etc.

[3] *A Letter to the Right Honorable Lord Viscount H——e*, Edit. London: 1779, 42, 43; *Letter from "Cicero" to Lord Howe*, 196; Wraxall's *Memoirs*, 163; etc.

[4] *A Letter to the Right Honorable Lord Viscount H——e*, 43, 44; *Letter from "Cicero" to Lord Howe*, 1, 2; etc.

[5] *A Letter to the Right Honorable Lord Viscount H——*, 42, 43; *Letter from "Cicero" to Lord Howe*, 7-9; *The Middlesex Journal and Advertiser*, No. 1207, London: From Saturday, December 14, to Tuesday, December 17, 1776; etc.

"been unavoidably taken up in landing at Frog's-"neck, instead of going, at once, to Pell's-point, "which would have been an imprudent measure, as it "could not have been executed without much un-"necessary risk.

"On the twenty-eighth of October, the engagement "at the White-Plains took place. But it has been "asserted, that, by my not attacking the lines, on the "day of that action, I lost an opportunity of destroy-"ing the Rebel Army; and it has been also said, "that I might have cut off the enemy's retreat by the "Croton-bridge. Sir: an assault upon the enemy's "right, which was opposed to the Hessian troops, "was intended. The Committee must give me credit "when I assure them, that I have political reasons, "and no other, for declining to explain why that as-"sault was not made. Upon a minute inquiry, those "reasons might, if necessary, be brought out, in evi-"dence, at the Bar. If, however, the assault had been "made, and the lines carried, the enemy would have "got off, without much loss; and no way had we, "that I could ever learn, of cutting off their retreat "by the Croton-bridge. I cannot conceive the foun-"dation of such an idea. By forcing the lines, we "should, undoubtedly, have gained a more brilliant "advantage, some Baggage, and some Provisions; but "we had no reason to suppose that the Rebel Army "could have been destroyed. The ground in their "rear was such as they could wish, for securing their "retreat, which, indeed, seemed to be their particular "object. And, Sir, I do not hesitate to confess that, "if I could, by any manœuvre, remove an enemy "from a very advantageous position, without hazard-"ing the consequences of an attack, where the point "to be carried was not adequate to the loss of men to "be expected from the enterprise, I should certainly "adopt that cautionary conduct, in the hopes of "meeting my adversary upon more equal terms."[1]

The careful student of that portion of the history of our own country which relates to the Campaign in Westchester-county, in 1776, will arise from the examination of it with the words on his lips which the Apostle Paul employed, in another connection: "God "hath chosen the foolish things of the world to con-"found the wise, and God hath chosen the weake "things of the world, to confound the mighty things, "and vile things of the world, and things which are "despised, hath God chosen, and things which are "not, to bring to nought things that are."[2]

Henry B. Dawson

[1] *Speech of General Howe before the Committee of the House of Commons, April 29, 1779*—Almon's *Parliamentary Register*, Fifth Session, Fourteenth Parliament of Great Britain, xii., 324.

See, also, *The Narrative of Sir William Howe*, 6, 7.

[2] *The Newe Testament*, Genevan Version, Edit. London: 1595, 1 Corinthians, i., 27, 28.

5748